

ATTITUDES OF WHITE METHODIST CHURCH MEMBERS IN
SELECTED LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN AREA CHURCHES
TOWARD RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION OF THE NEGRO

by ^{cc}

Roger Ragan

A Dissertation Presented to the
FACULTY OF THE
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

June, 1963

Roger Ragan
under the direction of his Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented to
and accepted by the Faculty of the Southern California
School of Theology in partial fulfillment of the re-
quirements for the degree of

Faculty Committee

Harvey Kiper
Chairman

John L. Meyer
Steward J. Chishell, Jr.

Date June 1963

E. Thomas Trotter

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the members of his faculty committee for the valuable assistance they gave during the course of this study. The committee consisted of Professors Harvey J. Seifert, John L. Mixon, and Howard J. Clinebell. As chairman of the committee, Dr. Seifert made available unlimited time, plus wise and stimulating counsel.

The writer also gratefully acknowledges the assistance of William R. Larson, Research Head of the Youth Studies Center, University of Southern California, on certain aspects of the statistical and research procedures used in the study.

For the indispensable support and active assistance received from his wife, Pauline K. Ragan, during the work on this project, the writer here records his indebtedness and admiration.

Finally, the writer's gratitude goes to the members and ministers of the eleven churches cooperating in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION OF THE PROBLEM	1
Statement of the Problem	
Value of the Study	
Theoretical Frame of Reference	
Definition of Terms	
Major Hypotheses	
Research Methodology	
The Sampling Procedure	
The Mailed Questionnaire	
Statistical Analysis of the Data	
Description of the Respondents' Churches	
Limitations of the Study	
Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation	
 II. RACIAL RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION IN THE UNITED STATES	 40
The Historical Background	
Social, Economic, and Political Consequences of Racial Residential Segregation	
The Present Situation	
 III. RACIAL RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION IN THEOLOGICAL AND ETHICAL PERSPECTIVE	 66
The Doctrine of God	
God as Creator	
God as Judge	
God as Redeemer	

Chapter	Page
The Norm of Christian Love	
The Community Ethic	
The Doctrine of Man	
Racial Residential Segregation as Chal- lenged by the Christian Understanding of the Basic Institutions of Society	
The Family	
The Economic Order	
The State	
Education	
The Church	
IV. RELATED STUDIES AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	93
General Attitudes toward Racial Residen- tial Segregation	
The Relationship between Religion and Prejudice	
Church Members' Attitudes toward Racial Residential Segregation	
V. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	106
Comparison of Church Members' Attitudes in Integrated and Segregated Neighborhoods	
General Attitudes toward Negro Residential Proximity	
Opinions regarding Consequences of Negro Residential Proximity	
Social Significance Attached to Residen- tial Segregation of the Negro	
Opinions regarding the Local Church's Role	
Good Acquaintance or Friendship with Negroes and Tolerance of Negro Residen- tial Proximity	
Employment with Negroes and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	
Home Ownership and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	
Involvement in Church Program and Toler- ance of Negro Residential Proximity	
Residential Proximity and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	
Education and Tolerance of Negro Residen- tial Proximity	

	Page
Age and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	
Frequency of Church Attendance and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	
Variables Found Not Significant	
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	200
Summary of the Findings	
Conclusions	
Suggestions for Further Study	
APPENDIX	213
I. Facsimile of Cover Letter	
II. Facsimile of the Questionnaire	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	220

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number and Percentage of Respondents to the Questionnaire by Churches	27
2.	Number of Members of Churches	32
3.	Total and Negro Population in Los Angeles County by Census County Divisions	34
4.	Total and Negro Population of Communities in which Churches in Study are Located .	35
5.	Number and Percentage of Respondents from Churches in Integrated and Segregated Neighborhoods by Divisions of Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity Scale . .	108
6.	Attitudes toward Negroes Moving into the Neighborhood and Next Door	110
7.	Attitudes toward Residential Segregation of the Negro	117
8.	Opinions regarding Consequences of Negro Residential Proximity	123
9.	Social Significance Attached to Problem of Residential Segregation of Negroes by Tolerance Scale Divisions	133
10.	Social Significance Attached to Community Problems	134
11.	Opinions on the Role of the Church regarding Residential Segregation of Negroes	138
12.	Acquaintance or Friendship with Negroes and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	147
13.	Close Social Contacts and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	148

Table	Page
14. Employment with Negroes and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	154
15. Home Ownership and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	157
16. Involvement in the Church Program and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	160
17. The Association of Involvement in the Church Program and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity, Controlling for Acquaintance-Friendship	168
18. The Association of Involvement in the Church Program and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity, Controlling for Education	170
19. Living near Negroes and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	176
20. Education and Tolerance of Negro Resi- dential Proximity	182
21. Age and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	188
22. Church Attendance and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity	191
23. Frequency of Church Attendance and Tolerance of Negro Residential Prox- imity	193
24. Weekly Church Attendance and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity by Involvement in the Church Program	197

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION OF THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

This study attempts: (1) to discover important attitudes toward residential segregation of the Negro which are held by white Methodist church members in selected Los Angeles metropolitan area churches; (2) to discover factors associated with these attitudes; (3) to learn something of what these church members feel the role of their local churches should be in relation to the problem; (4) to determine the degree of social significance the members attach to the problem; and (5) to ascertain if there is a significant difference in attitudes toward the problem between members belonging to churches in neighborhoods where Negroes reside and members belonging to churches in neighborhoods where Negroes do not reside.

Value of the Study

There is no more important domestic social problem facing the nation or the churches than that of the crisis in race relations. Students of race relations generally agree that in the North and West the issue of racial resi-

dential segregation presents one of the most crucial aspects of the problem.

Racial residential segregation is the basis for other forms of segregation and serves as a stimulant to prejudice and discrimination. The Christian Church cannot hope to become racially inclusive in any meaningful way until racial residential segregation is markedly reduced.

It is hoped that this study, limited in scope as it is, will make a contribution to the better understanding of the problem if it can measure pertinent attitudes. The writer holds with Holtzman:

A necessary prerequisite to reasonable social action... is a clear understanding of underlying attitudes and beliefs held by the people who are inevitably influenced by such action.¹

It is possible that some of the findings will be helpful to church leaders in their efforts to develop Christian social concern and chart Christian social strategy.

It is further hoped the study will be an addition to the store of knowledge about attitudes toward racial residential segregation, and that it will have some relevance to theories concerning the relationship between prejudice and religion. In a limited way--since this study

¹Wayne H. Holtzman, "Attitudes of College Men toward Non-Segregation in Texas Schools," Public Opinion Quarterly, XX (1956), 559.

does not attempt to measure tolerance or prejudice, per se, --it may be relevant to general theories of prejudice.

Theoretical Frame of Reference

Although this study does not attempt to measure prejudice or tolerance, per se (since it purports to measure tolerance of Negro residential proximity), the prejudice concept is necessary for the theoretical frame of reference.

The writer accepts, as a part of his theoretical frame of reference, the developing, comprehensive theory of prejudice noted by Simpson and Yinger. This theory "is developing around three highly interactive but analytically distinct factors, each the convergence of several lines of theory and evidence."¹

First, a part of the causation of prejudice is seen as residing in the "needs" of the individual personality. The frustration-aggression hypothesis is one example of this. Hostile impulses may arise when an individual has some of his goals blocked. It may be impossible or inexpedient for him to vent his hostility on the actual source of his frustration. The aggressive impulses may then be accumulated and at a later time this free-floating hostili-

¹George Eaton Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities (Rev. ed.; New York: Harper & Bros., 1958), p. 70.

ty may be displaced onto a minority group.¹ The psychological mechanism of projection is also important. For a variety of reasons persons develop impulses which give rise to guilt feelings. These feelings are often repressed. The resulting tension is relieved if this guilt can be projected onto someone else or onto some other group.² Prejudice may reflect the personality in several other ways. It may be used in an effort to bring meaning into a confusing situation.³ It may be used to give support to one's self esteem by demeaning an "inferior" group.⁴ Some studies have found a significant relationship between prejudice and emotional disorder.⁵ Many psychologists embrace the theory that there is a prejudiced "personality type." The authors of The Authoritarian Personality comment:

Thus a basically hierarchical, authoritarian, exploitive parent-child relationship is apt to carry over into a power-oriented, exploitively dependent attitude toward one's sex partner and one's God and may well culminate in a political philosophy and social outlook which has no room for anything but a desperate clinging to what appears to be strong and a disdainful rejection of whatever is relegated to the bottom.⁶

A second explanation of prejudice in this emerging, comprehensive theory is found in the structure of society.

¹Ibid., p. 76.

²Ibid., p. 83.

³Ibid., p. 85.

⁴Ibid., p. 86.

⁵Ibid., p. 89.

⁶T. W. Adorno, et. al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950), p. 971.

Power arrangements loom large in this interpretation:

It seeks to find out who makes the key economic, political, educational, and religious decisions in a society, and to what degree they employ prejudice against minority groups in order to make those decisions as favorable to themselves as possible.¹

The prejudice component in the intergroup conflict and competition that operates here is often not recognized. Prejudice in this context is likely to be unconscious and hidden. Ethnocentrism, "belief in the unique value and 'rightness' of one's own group,"² is the basic attitude buttressing the employment of prejudice as a group weapon. Examples of this are seen in the United States' discriminatory immigration legislation and the "relocation" of Japanese-Americans from the west coast during World War II.³

Culture itself is understood as the third basic cause of prejudice. The average white child in our culture comes by a belief in the superiority of the Caucasian race very naturally:

The speech and action of those around him, his observation of status differentials among the races, the jokes he hears, the histories he reads, the rewards and punishments he receives for various actions towards members of minority groups all teach him the correct behavior as it is defined by his society.⁴

It is thus possible for an individual to be almost devoid of strong personality needs which are productive of preju-

¹Simpson, op. cit., p. 70.

²Ibid., p. 114. ³Ibid., pp. 126-132.

⁴Ibid., p. 71.

dice and for him to be relatively removed from the processes of group conflict, but still develop a measure of prejudice through the natural process of cultural transmission of norms and attitudes. However, this aspect of the comprehensive theory of prejudice does not explain the basic origins of prejudice and its presence in the culture. For the more basic causative factors one must turn to the personality and group functions.

Simpson and Yinger warn against the error of reductionism in seeking the cause of prejudice. That is, "explaining the total by the abstracted part."¹ Nonetheless, reductionist interpretations abound--the psychological, the economic, the cultural, etc. Allport notes that no single approach will suffice:

We may lay it down as a general law applying to all social phenomena that multiple causation is invariably at work and nowhere is the law more clearly applicable than to prejudice.²

Allport's theory of "extrinsic" and "intrinsic" religious types also has relevance for this study.³ He holds that many children are taught a rather narrow type of religion which emphasizes the virtues of their own par-

¹Ibid., p. 110.

²Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), p. 218.

³Gordon W. Allport, "Religion and Prejudice," The Crane Review, II, No. 1 (Fall, 1959), 1-10.

ticular brand of religion and depicts God as a benefactor who is especially disposed to grant favors to members of this elect group. If the child also has engendered in him feelings of insecurity and inferiority he may develop a life-economy dominated by tendencies toward exclusion. For this person, says Allport, religion has only an instrumental role:

It serves and rationalizes assorted forms of self interest. In such a life the full creed and full teaching of religion are not adopted. The person does not serve his religion; its function is to serve him. The master-motive is always self-interest. In such a life-economy religion has extrinsic value only. And it is extrinsic religion, thus defined, that we find most closely associated with prejudice.¹

The intrinsic religionist gets a better start in life. He grows to maturity in a home atmosphere which offers emotional warmth and security. At adolescence he is able to begin to appreciate and accept persons of different racial and cultural backgrounds. He retains his religious faith and sees no need to interpret it in narrow, dogmatic terms which would disparage out-groups. His religion is invested with humility and he withholds judgment on other religions, races and out-groups. It is in this kind of religion that the teaching of brotherhood finds congenial soil for growth.² Allport writes:

Thus the relationship between religion and prejudice hinges on the type of religion that the personal life harbors. When it is of the extrinsic variety the tie

¹Ibid., p. 9.

²Ibid., p. 9.

with prejudice is close; when of the intrinsic sort the relationship is reverse.¹

Before terminating this discussion of the prejudice concept the writer wishes to note the precise definition of prejudice he accepts for his theoretical frame of reference:

Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group.²

The writer now turns to certain concepts within the theoretical frame of reference which apply more specifically to the principal focus of this study--residential segregation of the Negro.

Important among these is the drive for security which is seen in the majority group. Tillman has noted that the quest for security in our culture dates back at least to the founding of the nation. Those who came here had the pursuit of security as one of their important goals.³

Social mobility is another significant characteristic of American culture. Merton notes that our society places a high premium on "social ascent for all its mem-

¹Ibid., p. 10.

²Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, op. cit., p. 9.

³James A. Tillman, Jr., "Fair Housing: A Conceptual and Analytic Frame of Reference," The Journal of Intergroup Relations, I, No. 4 (1960), p. 2.

bers."¹ There can be little doubt that such a socially mobile society as ours is anxiety-producing. There is always the danger that one will fall behind in the upward ascent. Robin Williams writes:

The tension level of any social grouping is in part a function of the relative emphasis in that group's culture upon participation in common values as over against individual or group acquisition of scarce goods.²

Tillman holds that status symbols in our culture are "scarce goods" and that eventually the individual discovers that there are realistic limitations on what he can achieve in this area. A frequent consequence is frustration and aggression which is sublimated or displaced.³ He contends that residential segregation is essential to the existence of lower caste-like groups, such as Negroes, and "often serves the purpose of providing members of the superordinate group with symbols on which they may displace and sublimate their aggression."⁴ At the same time the existence of such a group serves to enhance the majority group member's feelings of self esteem and security.⁵

The concept of compartmentalization plays an impor-

¹Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949), p. 76.

²Robin M. Williams, Jr., The Reduction of Inter-group Tensions (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947), 55-56, quoted in Simpson, op. cit., p. 107.

³Tillman, op. cit., p. 5.

⁴Ibid., p. 5. ⁵Ibid., p. 7.

tant role in attitudes toward racial residential segregation. A white person, for example, may impute equality to the Negro in a limited and well-defined area without applying the concept of equality to the personality of the Negro as a whole. There are those white persons who support school integration and fair employment practices, but draw the line at residential integration. Thus, by the process of compartmentalization, the white person may adopt an attitude of equality toward the Negro in certain limited respects while still withholding an imputation of full equality. Residential integration would tend to bestow full equality upon the Negro.¹

The concept of reference groups is pertinent for this study. Sherif defines reference groups as "those groups to which the individual relates himself as a part or to which he aspires to relate himself psychologically."² Psychological and sociological studies indicate that the individual derives his basic attitudes from the values or norms of the groups to which he considers himself related, that is, from his reference groups.

The concept of culture is also germane and requires definition:

¹Ibid., p. 12.

²Muzafer Sherif, "Reference Groups in Human Relations," in Lewis Coser and Bernard Rosenberg (eds.), Sociological Theory (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957), p. 261.

Culture is the continually changing patterns of learned behavior and the products of learned behavior (including attitudes, values, knowledge, and material objects) which are shared by and transmitted by the members of society.¹

Kluckhohn observes that a principal reason why people normally adhere to cultural patterns is that they thereby gain a sense of solidarity with their group and escape a feeling of loneliness.²

An understanding of the concept of segregation is essential to this study. The writer accepts the definition advanced by Quinn:

Segregation, as an ecological concept, typically involves the process of concentration in that greater numbers of ecological units of a given type occur in one or more sections of a territory than in others, but the concept carries the added implication that the segregated units are in some way set off from others of contrasting types. Segregation is a sifting, sorting process by which people or institutions are formed into contrasting substantive sub-areas. In addition to the mere concentration of units of a given type into a sub-area, segregation implies a tendency toward the exclusion of units of the segregated type from other sub-areas.³

The concept of accommodation is significant in this study. Cuber gives this definition:

Accommodation refers to a permanent or temporary termination of rivalrous interaction which, while not nec-

¹John F. Cuber, Sociology (3rd ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955), p. 56.

²Clyde Kluckhohn, "The Study of Culture," in Coser, op. cit., p. 52.

³James A. Quinn, Human Ecology (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950), p. 305.

essarily settling the issue involved in the rivalry, permits the rivalrous parties to function together without open hostility at least in some respects.¹

In this study the concept of accommodation is seen as applying to the interaction of Christian faith and secular culture. Campbell and Pettigrew,² and Lensky³ have recently commented on Protestantism's tendency to compromise with secular culture. Troeltsch has long since noted the distinction between the religious "sect" which emphasizes allegiance to high ideals, and the "church" which tends to accommodate to culture in many respects.⁴

The concept of association is relevant to the study. It does, though, require some qualification as it is employed here. The type of association or contact between persons and groups is all important. Tension-laden association or contact can be productive of hostility. On the other hand:

Pleasant, equal-status contact that makes it unnecessary for the individuals to cross barriers of class, occupational, and educational differences as well as differences in symbolic (nonfunctional) group membership represented by such symbols as "race" is likely

¹Cuber, op. cit., p. 605.

²Ernest Q. Campbell and Thomas F. Pettigrew, Christians in Racial Crisis (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1959), pp. 128-133.

³Gerhard Lensky, The Religious Factor, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1961), pp. 317 ff.

⁴Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, translated by Olive Wyon (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931), I, 82 ff.

to reduce prejudice.¹

The social distance concept also has a bearing on this study. This relates to the feelings of acceptance or rejection that persons or groups have for one another. Thus in a preference ranking of some forty groups by persons in our culture, persons of English ancestry are usually found at the top and Negroes at the bottom.²

Definition of Terms

A number of terms used in the study require operational definition.

The Methodist churches involved in this study are all a part of the main body of Methodism in the United States. The Methodist Church, as it exists at the time of this study, is a union of three formerly separate branches of the Methodist denomination. The Methodist Episcopal Church, The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Church united to become "The Methodist Church" on May 10, 1939.³

A church member is defined as a person who has been officially received into the membership, and whose name is recorded on the membership roll, of one of the local churches involved in the study. A person who merely at-

¹Simpson, op. cit., p. 757.

²Ibid., p. 155.

³Doctrines and Discipline of The Methodist Church, 1960 (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1960), p. 7.

tends or in some other way has an association with a particular church is not considered to be a member.

The Los Angeles metropolitan area is here operationally defined as the city of Los Angeles, California, and surrounding incorporated cities, unincorporated areas, and unincorporated places which are socially and economically integrated with the city. This is in line with the United States Bureau of the Census definition of a standard metropolitan area.¹

A white person is defined as a person who is a member of the Caucasian racial grouping of mankind, commonly called "white." Caucasians, or whites, are to be distinguished from the other two major groups--the Mongoloid and the Negroid.²

The Negro is operationally defined as any person who is identified by the community at large as a member of the Negro race. In our society this person does not necessarily exhibit all or most of the physical characteristics normally associated with persons of the Negroid race.³ As a result of the extensive sexual association of Negroes and whites many persons who are identified as Negroes in

¹Davis McEntire, Residence and Race (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), p. 17.

²A. L. Kroeber, Anthropology (Rev. ed.; New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc., 1948), p. 132, quoted in Simpson, op. cit., p. 45.

³Simpson, op. cit., p. 45.

our society are really of racially mixed backgrounds.¹

Residential segregation of the Negro is here defined as that process whereby Negroes are concentrated in prescribed residential areas and are excluded from residential areas commonly considered to be reserved for whites. Historically residential segregation has been a result of the Negro's low economic status, his group cohesion, and external pressures. Racial discrimination has become increasingly important as a causative factor in residential segregation.²

Tolerance of Negro residential proximity is operationally defined according to the answers of the respondents to the five questions in the questionnaire which comprise a scale purporting to reveal the attitudes of the respondents toward living close to Negroes.

Major Hypotheses

Note is here taken of the major hypotheses involved in the study.

1. In general, the attitudes of Methodist church members toward residential segregation of the Negro fall far short of the norm implied in their Christian faith and explicitly espoused in the pronouncements of their denomination. When cultural and religious values are placed in

¹Simpson, op. cit., p. 540.

²McEntire, op. cit., pp. 71-73.

juxtaposition at this point, the former are transcendent.

2. Conventional religious activity is related inversely to tolerance of minority groups. Those persons who attend church frequently but who are not highly involved in the program of the church evidence less tolerance of Negro residential proximity than those members who attend rarely and are not at all involved.

3. A high degree of involvement in religious activity is directly related to tolerance of minority groups. Those persons who attend church regularly and who are involved in leadership positions in the church are more tolerant of Negro residential proximity than either the conventionally religious or the fringe members.

4. Leaders in national and community life, the communication media, the Methodist denomination, and local Methodist churches have not done enough to make Methodists aware of the crucial nature of the problem of racial residential segregation. Hence, the great majority of Methodists do not perceive it as a serious social problem.

5. The overwhelming majority of Methodists do not view aggressive social action as a legitimate function of their local churches. Hence, the great majority of Methodists do not favor their churches' playing an active role in supporting or opposing racial residential segregation.

6. Experience in living in a racially mixed neighborhood is directly related to favorable attitudes toward

living in such neighborhoods.

7. In recent decades there has been a trend toward tolerance both in the nation and within The Methodist Church (in its educational materials for the church school, youth groups, etc.). This trend is reflected in a higher tolerance of Negro residential proximity evidenced in the younger adult groups than in the older adult groups among Methodist church members.

8. Along with the general trend toward tolerance in this nation in recent decades has come a greater willingness to reside in racially mixed neighborhoods, with recent nationwide surveys indicating a majority of white respondents are willing to do so. Hence, it is hypothesized that the majority of Methodists do not disapprove of Negroes moving into their neighborhoods.

9. For a variety of reasons (important among them the fear of loss of investment, the fear of loss of status, the fear of loss of associations) Methodists are considerably less inclined to approve of Negroes' moving in next door than into the neighborhood.

10. Equal-status contact with Negroes is directly related to tolerant attitudes toward Negroes and to tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

11. One result of the residential segregation of the Negro in the Los Angeles metropolitan area is a low degree of contact and social communication between Negroes

and white Methodists living in the area.

12. Persons who have college education exhibit more tolerant attitudes toward Negro residential proximity than do persons with less education.

13. Persons who own or are purchasing their homes (and who therefore have a greater economic investment in their housing and are not as mobile as renters) exhibit less willingness to live in neighborhoods where Negroes are moving in than do persons who are renting houses or apartments.

Research Methodology

The Sampling Procedure

The respondents in this study were white adults who were members of eleven Methodist churches located in suburban Los Angeles, California. These churches were located in the Pasadena and San Gabriel Valley census county divisions. Both areas are contiguous to the city of Los Angeles. The Pasadena Division borders Los Angeles on the north and east. The three San Gabriel Divisions stretch primarily eastward of the Los Angeles city limits. All of the communities represented by the eleven churches are a part of the Los Angeles metropolitan area. All of the churches are within 25 miles of the Los Angeles city limits and most are much closer.

It is important to observe that two of the eleven

churches were selected because they were located in neighborhoods which had been undergoing racial residential integration for the past several years. Negroes were in the majority of those minority group members moving into the two neighborhoods. The two churches involved each had a handful of Negro members, but only white members in these churches were included in the study.

The eleven churches were selected from the twenty-six Methodist churches in the areas under study which had predominantly white memberships. Negro churches and predominantly Mexican-American churches were excluded at the outset.

The twenty-six churches had a combined membership of 23,500.¹ The eleven churches selected had a combined membership of 7,275. After the two churches in integrated neighborhoods had been selected (in order that they might afford some comparison to churches in segregated neighborhoods), the problem of selecting as representative a group as possible from the other twenty-four remained. It was determined that a minimum of 250 respondents would be sought. In view of the fact that a 10 per cent random sample of the church memberships had been decided on, it was estimated that the questionnaire would need to go to

¹Journal of the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference, The Methodist Church (Los Angeles: Methodist Publishing House, 1960), pp. 240-248.

approximately 700 members to assure this minimum return.

Nine churches were selected from the remaining twenty-four. A purposive, non-probability sampling technique was used. The writer felt that in view of the small number of churches involved a more representative group could be obtained in this manner than by adopting a random sample technique. The churches were examined for three factors: size of membership, geographic location, and the general socio-economic level of the area in which they were located. The nine selected varied in size from just over 200 to just over 1,800. They were distributed fairly evenly throughout that section of the metropolitan area included in the study. Less attention was given to the third factor (socio-economic level), since this suburban area is not characterized by extremes of affluence and poverty. However, at least two of the churches were located in areas commonly held to be above average in their socio-economic level, and two of the churches were in areas which are usually considered to be somewhat below average in this respect.

Considerable time was expended by the writer in making contacts with the eleven churches and securing permission to mail the questionnaire to a sample of their memberships. Alternate churches had been selected in the event that some of those in the original selection could not cooperate. However, all eleven did cooperate.

The only request made of the churches was for permission to mail the questionnaire to a 10 per cent random sample of their adult members. The churches were not asked to sponsor or endorse the study. They were guaranteed one church would not be compared adversely with another. These factors, coupled with the fact that the study was being carried out under the direction of the faculty of the Southern California School of Theology (this being the official Methodist theological seminary in the area) were highly important in gaining the unanimous cooperation of the selected churches.

The Random Sample--Once access had been gained to the membership rolls of the eleven churches the writer drew from them a 10 per cent random sample of the adult members. This was done by taking the name of every tenth adult directly from the membership lists. Each of the churches kept its list in alphabetical order. Since there were eleven churches the selection of names from two of them began with the first name on the list. However, the selection from the other nine began from a different position on each list; the second, the third, and so on to the tenth. By this procedure a mailing list of 670 names was obtained. The questionnaire was mailed to these persons in November, 1962.

The Mailed Questionnaire

The research instrument used in this study was a

coded questionnaire which was mailed to the 670 persons in the selected sample. Careful consideration was given to the methods of questionnaire construction.¹ The questionnaire went through many revisions under the guidance of the writer's faculty committee.

Research specialists have often noted that people are reluctant to disclose their race prejudices.² It was felt that this problem might be compounded in the present study inasmuch as the questionnaire was sent to the respondents specifically because they were church members and their opinions, as church members, were solicited. Moreover, the questionnaire came from a source which most of them would probably identify with their own religious denomination. It has been noted that if respondents know who is sponsoring a study or what its purpose is they "often feel disposed to express appropriately favorable feelings, or at least, in a spirit of politeness, to withhold negative expressions."³

With these factors in mind, a concerted effort was made to free the respondents to express candid opinions.

¹Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook (eds.), Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: The Dryden Press, Inc., 1951) II, 423-462.

²Ibid., II, 441.

³Claire Selltiz et al., Research Methods in Social Relations (Rev. ed.; New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1959), p. 560.

Emotionally laden terms were avoided wherever possible. For example, the terms "segregation" and "integration" were not used in the questionnaire. In the cover letter emphasis was laid upon the fact that church leaders and conferences were on record in regard to race relations problems, but that this questionnaire sought the frank opinions of church members themselves. Since the churches involved in the study were not asked to sponsor it or give it publicity it is assumed that the respondents did not feel pressure from that source.

It is the feeling of the writer that this effort to elicit honest opinions and attitudes met with a large measure of success. The results obtained appear to go a long way toward validating this observation.

The envelope which was sent contained the five-page questionnaire, a return envelope, and the cover letter. No attempt was made to mark the questionnaires so that the identity of each respondent would be known. However, the questionnaires were marked so that the church from which each one came could be ascertained. This was accomplished by placing a very small ball point pen mark in an appropriate corner on the back of a designated page of the questionnaire. The mark was black in color and could easily have been taken for a spot of mimeograph ink used in the production of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was pretested on a group of sev-

enteen women who were members of a women's group at the First Methodist Church, Covina, California. This church was not involved in the study proper.

The Scale.--The writer designed a scale to measure tolerance of Negro residential proximity. It consisted of questions 8, 10, 13, 15, and 16 in the questionnaire. The sum of the weighted scores on these questions was derived for each respondent. This was designated as his "tolerance of Negro residential proximity score." Throughout most of the study this is abbreviated to "tolerance score." However, it is important to note that tolerance, per se, is not measured.

A summated, Likert-type scale was employed. The questions which comprised the scale are here listed. For questions 8 and 10 the respondents were asked to check one of five responses (the scoring weight given to each response is in parenthesis): Strongly Disapprove (1), Mildly Disapprove (2), Would be Undecided (3), Mildly Approve (4), Strongly Approve (5). For questions 13, 15, and 16 the respondents were asked to check one of these five: Strongly Agree (1), Mildly Agree (2), Undecided (3), Mildly Disagree (4), Strongly Disagree (5).

The questions:

8. If a Negro family of similar education and income to yours moved into your neighborhood, how would you feel about it yourself?

10. If a Negro family of similar education and income moved in next door to you how would you feel about it yourself?

13. It would be unfair for anyone in my neighborhood to sell or rent a house to Negroes, of similar education and income.

15. If a Negro family of similar education and income moved into my neighborhood I would begin looking for a new home elsewhere.

16. It is best for Negroes, no matter what their level of income and education, to live by themselves in one section of the community.

A "tolerance of Negro residential proximity scale" was constructed from the responses to these five questions. The scale was in a fourfold division: tolerant, mildly intolerant, intolerant, and very intolerant. Respondents with scores from 20-25 were classified as tolerant, those with scores from 15-19 as mildly intolerant, those with scores from 10-14 as intolerant, and those with scores from 5-9 as very intolerant.

Other sections of the questionnaire--Other sections of the questionnaire were designed to find attitudes regarding the degree of social significance attached to the problem of residential segregation of the Negro, the role the local church should play in relation to the problem, and the likelihood that certain situations would result

from Negroes' moving into the neighborhood. Also, a number of variables which the research literature suggested might bear on the subject were included in the questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire is in the appendix.

Response to the questionnaire.--In view of the fact that the percentage response to mailed questionnaires normally ranges between 10 and 50 percent¹ the response gained in this study can be considered good. Of the 670 mailed, 327 were returned. This is a percentage response of 48.8 per cent. However, a few questionnaires were returned too late to be included in the tabulation. Moreover, several respondents did not complete all of the questions on the tolerance of Negro residential proximity scale. These two groups totalled 35. Hence, 292 questionnaires from the total number of churches in the study were used.

It is important to note that the major data analysis was performed on the responses from the 9 churches located in neighborhoods where Negroes did not reside. The completed questionnaires from this group totalled 266, or a percentage of 43.9. The completed questionnaires from the 2 churches located in neighborhoods where Negroes did reside totalled 26, or a percentage response of 40.6.

Table 1 gives complete information on the number and percentage of questionnaires sent and returned.

¹Selltiz, op. cit., p. 241.

TABLE 1

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE BY CHURCHES

Church	Questionnaires					
	Sent	Returned	Percentage Returned	Incomplete or Late Returns	Included in Data Analysis	Percentage Included in Data Analysis
Churches in Segregated Neighborhoods						
Church of the Foothills, Duarte	33	17	51.5	4	13	39.4
Edgewood Meth. Ch., Azusa	19	12	63.2	2	10	52.6
First Meth. Ch., Alhambra	175	94	53.7	10	84	48.0
First Meth. Ch., Baldwin Park	41	18	43.9	0	18	43.9
St. James Meth. Ch., Pasadena	58	25	43.1	3	22	37.9
Sierra Madre Meth. Ch.	48	25	52.1	2	23	47.9
South Pasadena Meth. Ch.	69	35	49.3	1	34	49.3
Temple City Community Meth. Ch.	74	32	43.2	4	28	37.8
West Covina Meth. Ch.	89	36	40.4	2	34	38.2
Subtotal (Carried Forward)	606	294	48.5	28	266	43.9

TABLE 1 --Continued

Church	Questionnaires					
	Sent	Returned	Percentage Returned	Incomplete or Late Returns	Included in Data Analysis	Percentage Included in Data Analysis
Subtotal (Brought Forward)	606	294	48.5	28	266	43.9
Churches in Integrated Neighborhoods ^a						
Altadena Meth. Ch.	33	20	60.6	2	18	54.5
Washington Blvd. Meth. Ch., Pasadena	31	13	41.9	5	8	25.8
Subtotal	64	33	51.6	7	26	40.6
Total	670	327	48.8	35	292	43.6

^aThese churches are not involved in the main body of data analysis in the study.

Statistical Analysis of the Data

Most of the data have been subjected to chi square analyses. In some instances the test of the difference between means was more appropriate. The statistical test employed to determine degree of association between variables was Tschuprow's T.

The conventional 5 per cent level of significance¹ was accepted for the study. That is, a difference in two samples was not considered significant unless the test used indicated the difference could not have occurred by chance more than 5 times in 100.

In concluding this section on research methodology it should be pointed up that this study does not purport to discover the causes of tolerant or intolerant attitudes toward Negro residential proximity which are held by the respondents studied. The study design utilized here does not permit such a claim. For example, factors other than those investigated here (e.g., psychological) could have an important causative relationship to tolerance of Negro residential proximity. This study does attempt to determine how the attitudes under study are associated with certain major variables. Insofar as these variables are concerned, the study sets out to determine not causation, but concom-

¹John H. Mueller and Karl F. Schuessler, Statistical Reasoning in Sociology (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 395.

itant variation and degree of association.

Description of Respondents' Churches

The two churches in neighborhoods where Negroes resided were the Altadena Methodist Church, Altadena, and Washington Boulevard Methodist Church, Pasadena. No study of the churches or their neighborhoods was planned, but the ministers of both churches confirmed the fact that the general neighborhoods in which the churches are located have experienced an influx of new Negro residents during the past several years. The process has been underway for a considerably longer time in the neighborhood of the Washington Boulevard church. The two churches have announced a policy of welcoming all races into their churches. At the time of the study, November, 1962, Altadena Methodist Church had 6 Negro members in its membership of 346 persons. Of the Washington Boulevard Methodist Church's 322 members, 8 were Negroes. Both of these churches are located in the Pasadena Census County Division.

The ministers of the other 9 churches confirmed the fact that all of these were located in white residential neighborhoods. In the case of those churches among the 9 which were located in a business district, the nearest residential neighborhoods to them were white. These churches had no Negro members.

The 9 churches are scattered throughout the four

census county divisions which comprise the geographical area included in the study. In the Pasadena Division are St. James Methodist Church, Pasadena; and South Pasadena Methodist Church, South Pasadena. In the East San Gabriel Valley Division are Edgewood Methodist Church, Azusa; First Methodist Church, Baldwin Park; and The West Covina Methodist Church, West Covina. The Southwest San Gabriel Valley Division has in it Temple City Community Methodist Church and First Methodist Church, Alhambra. In the Upper San Gabriel Valley Division are the Sierra Madre Methodist Church, Sierra Madre; and The Church of the Foothills (Methodist), Duarte.

Table 2 shows the size of membership of each of the churches involved in the study. An effort was made to select churches of varying sizes of membership.

No attempt was made to study the socio-economic level of the communities in which the eleven churches were located. However, from the writer's general knowledge of the Los Angeles metropolitan area and of the area in this study, he believes the communities in which the churches are located are generally typical of the socio-economic range found in suburban Los Angeles.

The Los Angeles County population is placed at 6,038,771 by the 1960 U. S. Bureau of the Census figures.

TABLE 2
NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF CHURCHES

Church	Number of Members
Church of the Foothills (Methodist), Duarte.....	378
Edgewood Methodist Church, Azusa.....	220
First Methodist Church, Alhambra.....	1801
First Methodist Church, Baldwin Park.....	456
St. James Methodist Church, Pasadena.....	662
Sierra Madre Methodist Church.....	543
South Pasadena Methodist Church.....	760
Temple City Community Methodist Church.....	795
West Covina Methodist Church.....	922
Altadena Methodist Church ^a	346
Washington Blvd. Methodist Church, Pasadena ^a	322

^aThe members of the Washington and Altadena Churches are not involved in the main body of data analysis in the study.

Source: Journal of the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference, The Methodist Church (Los Angeles: Methodist Publishing House, 1962), pp. 24-48.

Of this number, 461,546, or 7.64 per cent, were Negroes.¹

The Los Angeles metropolitan area has followed a pattern similar to that of other major metropolitan areas in the United States, in that the bulk of the Negro population concentrates in a few rather well defined residential areas. Most of them are near the center of the city.²

Table 3 shows the population by census county divisions in Los Angeles County in 1960, the total Negro population, and the percentage of the population which is Negro. It is noted that with the exception of the Pasadena Division (the city of Pasadena has a large Negro community), the four divisions which comprise the geographical area included in this study are fairly typical in the proportion of Negroes they have.³

In Table 4 we note the percentage of Negroes in the immediate community in which each of the churches is located, as recorded in the 1960 census. It is interesting to observe that 6 of the 9 churches in segregated neighborhoods are in communities wherein Negroes comprise less than one tenth of one per cent of the total population.

¹Los Angeles County, Commission on Human Relations, "A Statistical Analysis of Population by Race for Census County Divisions of Los Angeles County for 1960," taken from reports of the U. S. Census Bureau, pp. 1-8.

²Dorothy Slade Williams, "Ecology of Negro Communities in Los Angeles County: 1940-1959" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, University of Southern California, 1961), pp. 147-48, 155.

³Los Angeles Co., op. cit.

TABLE 3

TOTAL AND NEGRO POPULATION IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY
BY CENSUS COUNTY DIVISIONS, 1960

Census County Division	Total Pop.	Negro	Percentage
Burbank.....	90,155	29	0.03
Calabasas.....	11,896	102	.86
Compton.....	219,013	61,626	28.14
Downey-Norwalk.....	272,729	808	.29
East San Gabriel Valley ^a	403,182	1,579	.39
Glendale.....	136,524	68	.05
Inglewood.....	257,351	424	.17
Long Beach-Lakewood.....	423,023	9,701	2.29
Los Angeles.....	2,612,704	336,827	12.89
Newhall.....	15,550	955	6.14
North Antelope Valley.....	41,059	598	1.46
Palos Verdes.....	46,500	62	.13
Pasadena ^a	219,032	16,197	7.39
Santa Monica.....	83,249	4,060	4.88
South Antelope Valley.....	27,111	1,145	4.22
South Bay Cities.....	113,928	39	.03
Southeast.....	323,103	23,395	7.24
Southwest San Gabriel Valley ^a ...	205,950	181	.09
Torrance.....	100,991	24	.02
Upper San Gabriel Valley ^a ...	201,327	3,574	1.78
Whittier.....	234,394	152	0.07
Total	6,038,771	461,546	7.64

^aThe respondents in this study reside in these divisions.

Source: Los Angeles County, Commission on Human Relations, "A Statistical Analysis of Population by Race for Census County Divisions of Los Angeles County for 1960," taken from reports of the U.S. Census Bureau, pp. 1-8.

TABLE 4

TOTAL AND NEGRO POPULATION OF COMMUNITIES IN WHICH CHURCHES IN STUDY ARE LOCATED

Church	Community	Total Population	Negro	Percentage
Church of the Foothills	Duarte	13,962	555	3.97
Edgewood Meth. Ch.	Azusa	20,497	13	.06
First Meth. Ch., Alhambra	Alhambra	54,807	89	.16
First Meth. Ch., Baldwin Park	Baldwin Park	33,951	23	.06
St. James Meth. Ch.	Pasadena	116,407	14,587	12.53
Sierra Madre Meth. Ch.	Sierra Madre	9,732	4	.04
South Pasadena Meth. Ch.	South Pasadena	19,706	7	.04
Temple City Community Meth. Ch.	Temple City	31,838	3	.01
West Covina Meth. Ch.	West Covina	50,645	7	.01
Altadena Meth. Ch. ^a	Altadena	40,568	1,484	3.66
Washington Blvd. Meth. Ch. ^a	Pasadena	116,407	14,587	12.53

^aThese churches are not involved in the main body of data analysis in the study.

Source: Los Angeles County, Commission on Human Relations, "A Statistical Analysis of Population by Race for Census County Divisions of Los Angeles County for 1960," taken from reports of the U.S. Census Bureau, pp. 2-8.

The 1960 census figures show that, whereas Negroes constituted 7.64 per cent of the total county population, some 57 of the 105 incorporated cities, unincorporated places, and unincorporated areas contained less than one tenth of one per cent of Negroes. In 80 of these 105 the percentage of Negroes in the population did not exceed one half of one per cent.¹

Limitations of the Study

Only adult, white Methodist church members from one section of the Los Angeles metropolitan were studied. Involved in the main data analysis were 266 respondents from 9 churches.

It is recognized that the cross tabulations made in this study were limited in number. Ideally, it would have been desirable to have done more controlling of variables.

No attempt was made in this study to assess the relationship between the character of the respondents' religious beliefs and their feelings about residential segregation of the Negro. It is possible, for example, that some of the respondents may have genuinely felt that pro-segregation views are not incompatible with their religious convictions.

Although a simple random sample was used to obtain the respondents from within each church, a purposive, non-

¹Los Angeles Co., op. cit.

probability technique was employed to select the churches. However, the writer feels that due to the relatively small number of churches in the area under study, it was possible to obtain a more representative group by non-probability rather than by probability sampling in this instance.¹

A mailed questionnaire was used as the research instrument in this study. Some observers question the reliability of such an instrument. Some researchers feel the respondents who return a mailed questionnaire represent a biased sample of the universe under study.² However, there has not been a great deal of research on this question.

Two relatively recent studies lend support to the contention that there may not be significant differences between those who respond and those who do not. In a study of ethnic prejudice in a Southern California community in 1959 Rosenblum employed a structured interview with a 10 per cent sample of those who did not respond to his mailed questionnaire. He found that there was no statistically significant difference in prejudice scores between the two groups.³ Holtzman conducted a study of prejudice among undergraduate men at the University of Texas in 1952. The

¹Supra, p. 20.

²Selltiz, op. cit., p. 242.

³Abraham L. Rosenblum, "Social Class Membership and Ethnic Prejudice in Cedar City" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, University of Southern California, 1959), pp. 179-83.

university administration asked the students to cooperate in the study, and 546 of the 688 in the sample actually filled out the questionnaire (this was not, however, a mailed questionnaire).¹ Holtzman writes:

Seventy-three individuals complied only after intensive telephone follow up. Comparisons of the characteristics and responses of this delinquent group with those reported in the normal course of events revealed no systematic differences.²

Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation

Chapter II is a discussion of racial residential segregation in the United States. It includes the historical background, the present situation, and the political, social, and economic consequences.

Chapter III is a discussion of racial residential segregation in theological and ethical perspective. Attention is given to implications from the doctrine of God, the norm of Christian love, the community ethic, and the doctrine of man. There is also a discussion in this chapter of the manner in which racial residential segregation is challenged by the Christian understanding of the basic social institutions: the family, the economic order, the state, education, and the church.

Chapter IV presents related studies and a review of the literature. This involves a discussion of general stud-

¹Holtzman, op. cit., p. 560.

²Ibid.

ies describing attitudes toward racial residential segregation, studies describing the relationship between religion and prejudice, and the scanty research on church members' attitudes toward racial residential segregation.

Chapter V is a presentation and analysis of the data collected in the study.

Chapter VI includes the summary, conclusions, and suggestions for further study.

The appendix contains a copy of the questionnaire and the cover letter.

CHAPTER II

RACIAL RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The Historical Background

Vose writes:

Since feudal times the main tendency of Anglo-Saxon law has been toward the free and unrestrained sale and use of property. The practice was first given recognition¹ by the Statutes of Westminster III, enacted in 1290...

Robert C. Weaver, presently Administrator of the federal government's Housing and Home Finance Agency, has written:

Few Americans realize that widespread, enforced residential segregation on the basis of color is relatively new in the North and that complete spatial separation of the races is not characteristic of urban living in the South.²

In the years immediately following the Civil War neither the North nor the South was faced with the prospect of any large number of Negroes seeking housing in white communities or white neighborhoods. In the South the Negro was educationally and economically underprivileged. After

¹Clement E. Vose, Caucasians Only (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959), p. 2.

²Robert C. Weaver, The Negro Ghetto (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1948), p. 6.

being freed many of them drifted back to their former owners to work for food and lodging only. Most of the others could find only the worst kind of housing. Some of them lived in the out-of-doors, some in crude shacks, some in caves, and others in deserted houses. Life under such conditions was perilous. In some areas of the South as much as one third of the Negro population died during the first years of the post Civil War era.¹

The North experienced no appreciable Negro migration. The total northern and western population contained but 1.2 per cent Negroes in 1860. Half a century later the proportion had risen to only 1.6 per cent.²

Negroes moving to the North in the latter part of the nineteenth century were normally not restricted to any one section of the communities to which they moved. They often clustered in several small groups scattered throughout the community, and in some cities there was no distinct Negro community.³

Myrdal holds that discrimination "seems to be mainly a function of the relative number of Negroes in a community and its distance from the South."⁴ The treatment

¹Charles Abrams, Forbidden Neighbors (New York: Harper & Bros., 1955), pp. 18-19.

²Ibid., p. 19.

³Ibid., p. 22.

⁴Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma (New York: Harper & Bros., 1944), I, 601.

accorded the early Negro migrants to the North appears to lend support to this hypothesis. In New England, for example, the few immigrating Negroes met with little discrimination or segregation--residential or otherwise.¹

In most Southern communities a mixed pattern of Negro housing evolved. Some entirely separate Negro colonies grew up, some scattering of groups of Negroes throughout the community occurred, and considerable mixed neighborhood occupancy developed.² Though there does tend to be more mixed neighborhood occupancy in the South today than in the North, there is still segregation in these Southern situations. It is, as Myrdal put it, "ceremonial" segregation.³ As long as the Negro does not presume equality he may not present a threat by his physical proximity.

Historically, it has been helpful to Southern whites to have Negroes living nearby, since they have done much of the domestic and menial work for the white community. However, there has been a recent trend for the racial residential segregation pattern to harden in the South as increasing numbers of Negroes have moved from rural to urban areas.⁴ The stepped up Negro drive for equality in the

¹Ibid.

²Abrams, op. cit., p. 26.

³Myrdal, op. cit., I, 621.

⁴Abrams, op. cit., p. 26.

past decade has also probably increased many Southerners' desire to segregate the Negro residentially.

Urban areas in both North and South did not experience heavy Negro migration until well after the turn of the century. Migration to Southern cities began around 1915. Foreign immigration had been curtailed and there was a war-produced spurt in the national economy which required more labor. At about the same time the Negro began moving to the North:

Between 1910 and 1940 the net northward flow of Negroes totalled 1,750,000. By 1940, 2,439,201 Negroes lived in the North, east of the Mississippi, representing 19 per cent of the total Negro population in the country and 3.9 per cent of the total northern population.¹

Major industrial centers in the North which were east of the Mississippi were the goal of the majority of the Negro migrants. In the 1910-1920 decade Detroit's Negro population increased five fold. Cleveland, Chicago, and New York also had heavy increases. The poorly advantaged Southern Negro seemed strange to the Northern white. When he arrived in great numbers many of the white residents began to show signs of apprehension. At the same time the incoming Negroes' need for housing was at its peak, the United States entered World War I and building construction virtually ceased.²

¹Ibid., p. 24.

²Weaver, op. cit., pp. 27-29.

From the time of his Great Migration, beginning around 1915, the Negro became increasingly segregated residentially. They were largely unskilled laborers who had to accept the lowest paying jobs. It soon became easy to identify color with poverty. Due to the housing shortage, Negroes had to cram themselves into the existing Negro residential areas. Soon many of these areas began to take on the complexion of a slum-ghetto. This in turn enabled the white community to feel justified in restricting Negroes to the ghetto. However, as Negroes continued to pour into the cities of the North, additional living space for them became a physical necessity.¹ The needed space was generally obtained by extending the bounds of the ghetto. The manner in which this was accomplished resembled battle strategy.

Woofter writes:

The advance . . . is somewhat like that of an army. A small outpost is thrown out ahead, and, if the terrain is favorable for occupancy by larger numbers, the mass advances.²

Abrams cites five types of compulsions that tended to restrict Negroes to segregated residential areas--often to the slum-ghetto. First was physical compulsion. Actual violence, including the utilization of bombs, arson, vandalism, threats, and mob action. Secondly, structural con-

¹Ibid., p. 31.

²Thomas J. Woofter and Associates, Negro Problems in Cities (New York: Harper & Bros., 1928), p. 39 quoted in Weaver, op. cit., p. 32.

trols were employed. Some cities were simply out of bounds to Negroes. Others used such devices as walls, dead end streets, and parks to segregate Negroes. In the third place, social controls were used. This included practices of discrimination and segregation in most or all of the private and public facilities. Economic compulsions were a fourth device. This involved practices by private owners, the real estate profession, builders, and lending institutions to keep Negroes out of white areas. Legalized compulsions were a fifth technique. Involved here was the actual use of governmental power to control living space available to Negroes. Through such actions as condemnation, slum clearance, relocation involved in urban redevelopment, and policies of the Federal Housing Authority, the various levels of government could control the movements of great masses of Negroes.¹

Violence in controlling the actions and movements of Negro people had been more characteristic of the South than of the North. However, as the flow of Negro migrants northward continued, violence became increasingly prevalent there. This violence was frequently precipitated by housing tensions.²

In the early part of the century the city of Louis-

¹Abrams, op. cit., p. 77.

²Herman H. Long and Charles S. Johnson, People vs. Property (Nashville: Fisk University Press, 1947), pp. 73 ff.

ville, Kentucky, attempted to spread the zoning principle to racial residential segregation and set up definite zones for exclusive white and Negro residential use. However, this city ordinance was invalidated by the United States Supreme Court in 1917. Vose comments on this:

This and other decisions have made clear that a citizen was protected by the Fourteenth Amendment from state or city legislation which limited his right to acquire use, or dispose of property, solely because of race or color.¹

However, shortly after this 1917 decision privately adopted race restrictive covenants came into widespread use. These covenants bound those involved in property transactions not to sell to non-Caucasians. Such covenants were upheld by the equity courts and proved to be extremely effective in barring Negroes and other minorities from white neighborhoods. In 1948, however, such restrictive covenants were declared unenforceable by the Supreme Court.²

The real estate profession has played a key historical role in the residential segregation of the Negro. It has been instrumental in the promotion of the restrictive covenant. It has also adopted a policy of simply not selling property in white areas to Negroes. The principal national organization for realtors, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, issued a booklet in the early

¹Vose, op. cit., p. 3.

²Ibid., p. 5.

1940's which included this policy statement:

No property in a white section should ever be sold, rented, advertised, or offered to colored people.¹

Long and Johnson cite a 1943 statement by the same group which cautions realtors against "objectionable use" of property by undesirable elements, including Negroes:

The prospective buyer might be a bootlegger who would cause considerable annoyance to his neighbors, a madam who had a number of call girls on her string, a gangster who wants a screen for his activities by living in a better neighborhood, a colored man of means who was giving his children a college education and thought they were entitled to live among whites . . . No matter what the motive or character of the would-be purchaser, if the deal would instigate a form of blight, then certainly the well-meaning broker must work against its consumation.²

This organization, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, did soften its "code of ethics" somewhat in 1950:

A realtor should never be instrumental in introducing into a neighborhood a character of property or occupancy of any race or nationality . . . which will clearly be detrimental to property values in that neighborhood.³

Neighborhood groups have been another significant force in the development and perpetuation of racial residential segregation. Many of these groups, known variously as neighborhood improvement associations, homeowners' associations, or property owners' and tenants leagues, were

¹Simpson, op. cit., p. 489.

²Long, op. cit., p. 58.

³Abrams, op. cit., p. 157.

originally established out of commendable motives. They were instrumental in developing neighborhood pride and spirit, and did much to stimulate high standards in the maintenance and improvement of property. However, with the advent of the Negro immigration, these organizations frequently became the rallying point for those who desired to preserve the racial homogeneity of their neighborhoods. These associations made widespread use of the racial restrictive covenant, disseminated anti-Negro propaganda, held public protest meetings, and in some instances used threats and violence against incoming Negro families.¹

World War II brought another wave of Negro migration to the North. The West, too, began to share in this migration. From 1940 to 1944 six of the major Western cities experienced a 113 per cent increase in their Negro population. The Los Angeles metropolitan area gained 59,000 Negroes during this period.²

By the time of the World War II Negro migration the pattern of racial residential segregation was a nationwide fact. Hence, this second major migration tended to intensify the segregation pattern. By and large, the areas of Negro residential concentration were expected to absorb the newcomers. In some instances this eventually became a

¹Long, op. cit., pp. 39-55.

²Abrams, op. cit., p. 84.

physical impossibility and certain other areas were opened up for Negro occupancy. These areas normally bordered the existing Negro residential sections and simply served to expand the Negro ghetto in many cities.¹

At the same time the United States was involved in a battle against fascism abroad, its Negro citizens at home were being denied the basic freedom of choosing decent homes for themselves and their families. The denial of this freedom was frequently carried to the extent of rioting and other forms of violence against the Negro. The notorious Detroit race riot of 1942 was touched off when Negro families attempted to move into the Sojourner Truth public housing project.²

By the end of World War II racial residential segregation was more firmly established than ever. It appeared that most whites preferred it that way. The view that racially mixed neighborhoods would be productive of adverse social and economic consequences was prevalent in the press, housing journals and even college texts.

The federal government had now become the principal influence in homebuilding and its official policy reflected this background. Its considerable influence was in the direction of racial residential segregation.³

¹Weaver, op. cit., pp. 77-98.

²Long, op. cit., p. 52.

³Simpson, op. cit., p. 495.

The National Housing Act of 1934 brought the Federal Housing Administration into being. This organization unconditionally insures loans made to home builders or homeowners by lending institutions. Prior to 1950, when its policy toward residential segregation changed, this statement appeared in its official manual:

If a neighborhood is to retain stability, it is necessary that properties shall continue to be occupied by the same social and racial classes.¹

The FHA even promoted the use of a model racial restrictive covenant. Some builders who had not considered the use of such covenants found it necessary to discriminate to qualify for the assistance of the federal government.²

Social, Economic, and Political Consequences
of Racial Residential Segregation

Racial residential segregation increases the "visibility" of the Negro group. Experience in other countries has shown that Negroes are not nearly so "visible" when they intermingle with the majority group. Deutsch and Collins hold that "the 'seeing' of skin color is largely a function of existing social distinctions rather than something which, in itself, is perceptually natural . . ."³

¹Abrams, op. cit., p. 230 . ²Ibid.

³Morton Deutsch and Mary Evans Collins, Interracial Housing (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951), p. 141.

If our society segregated into certain neighborhoods all persons with red hair or all persons of Swedish descent, there would be much more public consciousness of them as distinct groups. There can be little doubt that stereotyping regarding the Negro is enhanced by his residential segregation.

Racial residential segregation reduces the likelihood that there will be person-to-person contacts between the minority and majority groups. Frazier comments that most whites and Negroes simply do not know each other as human beings and are cut off from normal human intercourse.¹ The authors of one study of interracial housing comment that there is much evidence to indicate that ethnic prejudices are mainly learned from:

. . . communicated attitudes of members of one's own group, rather than on the basis of direct experience with members of the group against which prejudice is entertained.²

Contact and communication between groups is essential to the kind of understanding which can help prevent friction.

McEntire has noted that racial residential segregation tends to serve as a stimulant to prejudice in transforming the competition between individuals into group conflict. Thus, the Negro who seeks a home outside the ghetto

¹E. Franklin Frazier, The Negro in the United States (Rev. ed.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1957), p. 677.

²Daniel M. Wilner, Rosabelle P. Walkley, and Stuart W. Cook, Human Relations in Interracial Housing (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955), p. 5.

is looked upon by the white as an invader to be repulsed. The vocabulary used to describe the process of racial change in a neighborhood is not without significance--terms like infiltration, invasion, retreat, succession.¹

This form of segregation also serves as a stimulant to segregation in other areas of life. The widespread de facto school segregation in the North and West is an outgrowth of racial residential segregation. Segregated neighborhoods tend to develop their own business enterprises. Recreational facilities and social organizations tend to follow the established segregated pattern. The Negro church, which has been the fundamental social institution of the Negro community, will be a necessity for that community as long as the segregation pattern obtains.²

Racial residential segregation has helped create the slum-ghetto. Numerous consequences grow out of this situation. Negro family disorganization is one. It may be too much to say, as do Long and Johnson, that "good housing produces sound, healthful community life. . ."³ Good housing, per se, probably cannot do this. But it would be difficult to argue with the same authors' contention that crowded ghettos (one result of residential segregation)

¹McEntire, op. cit., p. 96.

²Kyle Haselden, The Racial Problem in Christian Perspective (New York: Harper & Bros., 1959), p. 31.

³Long, op. cit., p. 1.

are productive of crime, disease, and family disorganization.¹ Frazier points out that while other factors are at work in creating family disorganization among Negroes, that their housing situation aggravates the problem:

Not only do Negroes live in the least desirable areas and most deteriorated structures but they are crowded into these areas and structures beyond the limits of health, hygiene, safety or decency.²

The lack of privacy and the overcrowding probably have an adverse effect on healthy sex and family relations.

Racial residential segregation is a barrier to good physical health for many persons. This, again, applies particularly to those Negroes confined to the slum-ghetto. A recent study found that persons under 35 years of age who remained in a Negro slum had more frequent episodes of illness and longer periods of disability than a control group which had been moved to better housing. These findings were especially true of the children in the 5-9 age group.³

Racial residential segregation contributes significantly to crime and delinquency as it functions to create and sustain the slum-ghetto. In discussing the causes of these and other forms of social deviation found among Negroes, Handlin notes the influence of slum life and weak-

¹Ibid.

²Frazier, op. cit., pp. 634-35.

³Daniel M. Wilner, et al., The Housing Environment and Family Life (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1962), pp. 244-48.

ness of its communal institutions. These institutions can not exercise the control and discipline found in better advantaged communities. Moreover, he suggests that such socially deviate behavior as crime and delinquency is brought about by forces inherent in slum life which weaken the group's sense of purpose in life.¹

Residential segregation restricts the opportunities Negroes have for social and economic progress. It places barriers in the way of their aspirations, experiences, and opportunities. The Negro child who is largely confined to his segregated community is handicapped in making the contacts and developing the skills which are essential to his achieving his fullest potentiality. Such youth run the danger of setting up false standards of excellence when confined to life experiences within their own disadvantaged group.² It is important to persons in business and in the professions to be able to have the "right" contacts and associations if they are to advance in their fields. The middle class Negro, for example, is severely limited by being shut off from the normal associations of neighborhood and community life.³

Racial residential segregation produces adverse

¹Oscar Handlin, The Newcomers (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 98.

²Weaver, op. cit., p. 270.

³McEntire, op. cit., pp. 98-99.

psychological effects in the life of the Negro. Kardiner notes that the Negro's aboriginal culture was smashed when he was transplanted from Africa to the United States and that "neither paternity nor permanent marriage could be recognized for this would interfere with the free mobility of the slave for sale purposes."¹ Other minorities in this country, such as the Jews, the Mexican-Americans, the Chinese, and the Japanese have had stronger cultural defenses than the Negro. Hence, it is probable that the segregation they have experienced has not been as debilitating and destructive in its influence on them as has been the case with the Negro.

When the Negro is separated and segregated he is made to feel inferior. Kardiner holds that the central problem of Negro adaptation:

. . . is oriented toward the discrimination he suffers and the consequences of this discrimination for the self referential aspects of his social orientation It means that his self-esteem suffers (which is self referential) because he is constantly receiving an unpleasant image of himself from the behavior of others to him.²

The Negro child growing up in the segregated community sees his parents as members of an inferior group. The normal process of embracing the parent as an ideal is

¹Abram Kardiner and Lionel Ovesey, The Mark of Oppression (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1951), p. 39.

²Ibid., p. 302.

thus made difficult. But if the Negro child is tempted to embrace the white as ideal he possesses "a recipe for perpetual self-hatred, frustration, and for tying one's life to unattainable goals."¹

There can be little doubt that racial residential segregation contributes to the creation of hostility within the Negro community which is directed toward itself (as well as creating hostility which is directed toward the dominant group). The frustration engendered by the restrictions imposed by residential segregation gives rise to aggressive impulses which cannot be discharged against the white community. Frequently this aggression is displaced against members of their own race. The frustrations of life in the ghetto are productive of crimes of violence committed by Negroes against Negroes.²

The indirect economic costs of racial residential segregation are immeasurable. These consist mainly of the absence from the national economy of the contribution Negroes could make if they were not restricted in their development by such factors as residential segregation, as well as the absence of their potentially higher purchasing power. The direct costs of residential segregation are seen in the millions of dollars annually that even some

¹Kardiner, op. cit., p. 310.

²Simpson, op. cit., p. 511.

medium-sized cities pay for their slum-ghettos. Weaver notes that municipal services rendered there cost greatly in excess of the revenues collected in the area. The differential cited in Newark, New Jersey in a typical year was \$14,000,000.¹ This cost cannot be laid exclusively at the door of racial residential segregation, but much of it rightfully rests there.

Another economic cost to the community is pointed up by Simpson and Yinger:

Discriminatory limitation on the supply of housing for minority groups means that owners of the houses that are obtainable have less incentive to maintain their property in decent condition--they can rent anyway. This deterioration lowers the value of the bordering property of white persons and injures the whole community through the total costs of the slums.²

Among the political consequences spawned by racial residential segregation is the tendency it has to create a division in the body politic. When a group is set apart it naturally tends to think more in terms of its own narrow interests. Given the segregation pattern, it is normal for Negroes to focus their political activities on racial problems rather than on problems confronting the nation and community as a whole. Moreover, the political activity of such a segregated group is more susceptible to machine control than would be the case if Negroes were integrated into

¹Weaver, op. cit., p. 257.

²Simpson, op. cit., p. 274.

American society.¹ This is not to deny the fact that under present circumstances the political cohesiveness of Negroes may not only be advisable, but one of the few effective means at their disposal with which to gain a greater measure of equality.

The strains and tensions between Negroes and law enforcement agencies are most serious and most prevalent in the slum-ghettos. Often there are differential standards of treatment by the police for Negroes and whites. A Philadelphia study showed that over 50 per cent of the district patrolmen found it "necessary" to be more strict with the Negro than with white offenders.² James Baldwin writes of the police in Harlem:

The only way to police a ghetto is to be oppressive Their very presence is an insult, and it would be if they spent their entire day feeding gumdrops to children. They represent the force of the white world, and that world's real intentions are, simply, to keep the black man corralled up here, in his place.³

The Negro preachers of black superiority and of race hatred against the white world find their most receptive audience in the ghetto. In his study of the Black Muslims, Lincoln observes that "the continuing problem of simply finding a decent place to live" is one of the con-

¹Ibid., p. 280.

²Ibid., p. 513.

³James Baldwin, Nobody Knows My Name (New York: The Dial Press, 1961), p. 65.

tributing influences to the making of a Black Muslim.¹

The Present Situation

The Commission on Race and Housing estimates that there are currently around 27 million United States citizens whose opportunities to live where they would like are limited to some degree by their racial or ethnic descent.² There is general agreement that the group suffering the most severe limitations is the Negro race--some 18 million in number.

The South, the traditional homeland of the American Negro, has seen the proportion of Negroes in its population fall from 33 per cent to 20 per cent since the turn of the century. The Negro has migrated in increasing numbers to the North and West. In the years since World War II there has been a stepped up trend of Negro migration to both areas and particularly to the West.³ One projection indicates that the Negro population of the South will grow only 16 per cent between 1950 and 1975. During that same period the North will experience a 150 per cent increase and the West an increase of 210 per cent.⁴

The recent Negro migration has also borne the

¹C. Eric Lincoln, The Black Muslims in America (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), p. 8.

²McEntire, op. cit., p. 2.

³Ibid., p. 11. ⁴Ibid., p. 20.

characteristics of a movement from rural to urban areas. Moreover, it has been a migration to the central or inner city portions of these urban areas. The city of Los Angeles, for example, experienced an actual decline in the rate of white population increase during 1950-1956, while its Negro population showed a sharp percentage increase in its growth rate.¹

Historically, minority and nationality groups have tended to migrate to the inner city. Other groups, as they have moved up in social status, have become dispersed residentially. To date the Negro who achieves an above average education, income, and occupation has not been granted the same freedom of mobility.

A study of twelve major metropolitan areas in 1950 indicates that the typical main area of Negro population concentration is near the business center of the city. The farther one proceeds from the core of that area the less numerous in proportion is the Negro population. Usually one encounters other pockets of Negro population concentration, much smaller in size, in other sections of the metropolitan area. In all but one city (San Francisco) between 56 and 81 per cent of the nonwhite population resided in residential areas whose population composition was at least half nonwhite.²

¹Ibid., p. 18.

²Ibid., pp. 33-34.

Nonwhite housing in the United States today is characterized by its advanced age, overcrowding, and substandard quality. Housing tends to be poorest in quality in the areas of highest Negro concentration. However, even in areas which have a lesser degree of Negro concentration the Negro homes tend to be substandard in a higher proportion than the other homes in their area.¹

Baldwin has recently given his view of what happens to the Negro from the South who joins the exodus to the North:

They do not escape Jim Crow: They merely encounter another, not less deadly variety. They do not move to Chicago, they move to the South Side; they do not move to New York, they move to Harlem. The pressure within the ghetto causes the ghetto walls to expand, and this expansion is always violent. White people hold the line as long as they can, and in as many ways as they can, from verbal intimidation to physical violence. But inevitably the border which has divided the ghetto from the rest of the world falls into the hands of the ghetto. The white people fall back bitterly before the black horde; the landlords make a tidy profit by raising the rent, chopping up the rooms, and all but dispensing with the upkeep; and what was once a neighborhood turns into a "turf."²

The ghetto area in Los Angeles has not been as overcrowded as similar areas in most metropolitan regions. Negroes in Los Angeles actually experienced a marked diminishment of the overcrowding problem during the 1950's. They began to spread into many census tracts where few Ne-

¹Ibid., pp. 36-38.

²Baldwin, op. cit., p. 68.

groes had previously resided. However, at the same time the white population was abandoning these areas for the suburbs at such a rate that once again the tendency for Negroes to live in separate areas increased.¹

There are now no legal means by which Negroes can be excluded from a residential area by reason of their race. This does not mean, however, that there are not extralegal or illegal means. One of the chief means is an informal, perhaps even unspoken, agreement among neighbors that they will not sell a home in their area to a Negro. In the average white neighborhood the pressure against such a sale is extremely strong.²

Racial residential segregation is also sustained in large part by the housing industry and those associated with it. Most home builders have a policy which excludes Negroes from any subdivisions but those intended for their exclusive occupancy. The financial institutions which extend mortgage credit will often not do so when confronted with a Negro who wishes to buy in a white neighborhood. Similarly, the Negro who wishes to buy or rent in a white area will encounter great difficulty in locating a real estate agent who is willing to deal with him.³

Violence and the verbalized threat of violence do

¹McEntire, op. cit., pp. 52-53.

²Ibid., p. 74. ³Ibid., p. 75.

not play as big a part today in discouraging Negro residential dispersion as was the case in earlier decades. However, such incidents still occur, both in the South and the North. The following happened in the Los Angeles metropolitan area in July, 1962, and was depicted in the press as a "racial row:"

Three men . . . pleaded guilty on Aug. 2 to charges that they had fired a gun into the occupied home of Thomas Wells, 31, at 800 W 120th St. . . . Wells, a Negro, had purchased the house from a Caucasian couple several weeks before the attack.¹

Doubtless many Negroes hesitate to move to a white area because they do not relish facing the nonviolent hostility with which many of their race have been greeted.²

Some Negroes do succeed in gaining entrance to previously all white areas. Once this has happened, more often than not, the whites begin to withdraw. In time it is likely to become a predominantly Negro area. In earlier decades a panic pattern developed. Whites hastened to sell their homes, usually at a loss, and the transition from a white to a Negro neighborhood was often a rapid one. The Commission on Race and Housing reports that in recent years this panic or flight pattern has decreased. A gradual shift to minority occupancy, sometimes requiring a period of many years, seems to be the dominant pattern now.³

¹Los Angeles Times, August, 21, 1962.

²McEntire, op. cit., p. 76.

³Ibid., p. 77.

There have been some neighborhoods which, after receiving one or a few Negro families, have undergone no further change over a period of many years. The key factor in determining whether or not a neighborhood can be stabilized seems to be the expectations the white residents (and potential white home purchasers) have regarding the future population composition of the area. If they anticipate that it will become a Negro neighborhood they abandon it. The exact proportion of Negroes which will cause whites to abandon an area cannot be accurately stated. This figure, called the "tip point," has been estimated at anywhere from 10 to 60 per cent. However, the combination of a number of factors in any given situation seems to determine it.¹

More is required for neighborhood stabilization than the willingness of whites to remain once Negroes have moved in. McEntire comments:

Unless a neighborhood can attract a continuing inflow of white homeseekers, it must tend inevitably to become a minority district in the course of normal turnover.²

There are a number of factors which tend to make equal housing opportunities more of a possibility for Negroes today than ever before. These include the rising economic and cultural position of the Negro, favorable court decisions, a general trend toward racial tolerance among whites, a growing body of equal rights legislation,

¹Ibid., p. 84.

²Ibid., p. 85.

pressure from groups interested in civil rights, the growing sensitivity of Americans to world opinion regarding racial discrimination in this country, and President Kennedy's 1962 executive order banning discrimination in certain federally assisted housing.¹

¹U. S., President (Kennedy), Executive Order: Equal Opportunity in Housing, Washington, D.C., Nov. 20, 1962.

CHAPTER III

RACIAL RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION IN THEOLOGICAL AND ETHICAL PERSPECTIVE

The Doctrine of God

A general discussion of the relationship of Christian faith to the area of race relations will not be undertaken. However, most of what Christian theology and Christian social ethics have to say on the subject is relevant to the narrower problem of racial residential segregation.

The Christian doctrine of God has certain definite implications for an understanding of this problem. Christians know God as Creator, as Judge, and as Redeemer.

God as Creator

God is the creator of the universe. He is also the creator of man. Christian theology holds that man has been created in the image of God.¹ Without God man would not even exist. "It is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves."² God is also the sustainer of life in men. Man

¹Genesis 5:1.

²Psalms 100:3, A.V.

is utterly dependent upon God the creator. Man's appropriate response, therefore, is a grateful love toward his creator.

As creator of all men, God loves all men equally. Significant for our problem, also, is the Christian belief that God has created men for fellowship with Him - and for community with Him.

He has created them to dwell with Him in one great family or kingdom. . . . Man is called to love his fellow-men and recognize his own responsibility for, and the privilege of, establishing fellowship and community with all of God's children.¹

God as Judge

Since all men sin they all eventually come under his judgment. Men often "exchange the truth about God for a lie" and turn to "worship the creature instead of the Creator."² Men rebel against their relationship and responsibility to God and their fellow men. Men engage in the sin of idolatry when they give a higher priority to their love of race, class, neighborhood, or family than they do to the demands God's love makes on them.

As with other sin, man cannot escape God's judgment in racial sin:

God confronts man as Accuser and as Troubler in the

¹E. Clinton Gardner, Biblical Faith and Social Ethics (New York: Harper & Bros., 1960), p. 353.

²Romans 1:25.

very intensity of the contradiction between creed and practice, in the desperation with which the self justifies itself in its racial pride, in the haste with which it covers its sin with pretensions to morality. The thrashings of the troubled conscience caught on the hook of God's judgment are nowhere more easily seen than in the clichés and phrases which are commonly made to justify segregation and the status quo."¹

When men fail to express justice and love in their relationships with other races they can expect to see God's judgment come partially in the form of increased racial discord and strife. Again, God's judgment may be evidenced in the deleterious effects racial sin has on the personalities of both those who sin and those who are sinned against. The judgment of a just God is no doubt manifest in the rise of movements which preach hate against the majority group, such as the Black Muslims. God's judgment on the churches for their failure to be the conscience of community and nation with respect to race relations is seen when, as a result, the churches lose their influence and opportunity to witness effectively in other areas. When an institution is found to have a moral blindspot in one area its relevance in others thereby becomes suspect.

When man recognizes he has been involved in racial sin and experiences God's judgment in this area, his proper response is that of humility and repentance.²

¹Waldo Beach, "A Theological Analysis of Race Relations," in Paul Ramsey (ed.), Faith and Ethics (New York: Harper & Bros., 1957), p. 217.

²Gardner, op. cit., p. 168.

God as Redeemer

By his sin man digs a chasm between himself and God. He becomes alienated from God and from his fellow man. It is in the character of God that man must come under His judgment when this happens. But the matter does not end there. God offers forgiveness to repentant man. If man so chooses, he can become reconciled to God. He can be redeemed, even though unworthy. When man experiences this kind of love from God he should understand that he is to imitate it in his relationships with other men:

That fellowship with God which the Word of God creates in faith is at the same time fellowship with man. The divine fellowship of faith must prove its truth and reality in the human fellowship of love.¹

By God's redemptive act man is also freed and empowered to achieve this right relationship with his fellows. The New Testament speaks to man's condition here:

For by grace you have been saved through faith; and this is not your own doing, it is the gift of God - not because of works, lest any man should boast.²

It is as if a man were to say to himself: "As unworthy as I am, God has forgiven and loved me. How then can I judge any man and consider him as being inferior to me? With humility and in a spirit of gratitude to God for the gift of His love I am to do all I can to love my neighbor and

¹Emil Brunner, The Divine Imperative, translated by Olive Wyon (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1937), p. 320.

²Ephesians 2:8-9.

meet his deepest needs." The man who would do less than this in his relationships with persons of another race places himself in the position of denying God's love and of impeding the development of the fellowship and community among men which God has intended.

With this general theological frame of reference as a backdrop, the writer turns now to a discussion of the specific ways in which residential segregation of the Negro violates theological and ethical principles of the Christian faith.

The Norm of Christian Love

Johnson defines Christian love as "growing interest in, appreciation of, and responsibility for every person as a member of one family of God."¹ Ramsey says:

Christian love means an entirely "neighbor-regarding concern for others," which begins with the first man it sees. Since this man may be any man, such love is, of course, universal in compass . . .²

Both would agree that this love has its origin in God's love for man. It is man's appropriate response to God's love.

Residential segregation of the Negro violates the all-inclusive and non-preferential character of Christian

¹Paul E. Johnson, Christian Love (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951), p. 26.

²Paul Ramsey, Basic Christian Ethics (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. 95.

love. The person who advocates such segregation is involved in exclusive rather than inclusive conduct. For whatever his particular reason may be he prefers to live among his own kind. In this area of his life there is no room for a non-preferential love. If it could be established that the Negro would suffer no disadvantage by living in a segregated status the proponents of residential segregation would be on less shaky ground. But their stance would still not be a steady one as seen from the viewpoint of Christian love. For there is still present the implication that these persons are different and somehow not worthy of acceptance on the same basis as others. There still exists an exclusive spirit which ultimately will not show the same concern and interest for the separated as for those who are taken into the inner circle of love and appreciation. Seifert says, "For a God of abundant, overflowing agape, a Father who loves beyond merit and to the point of sacrifice, rejection from fellowship is a grievous sin."¹

Residential segregation of the Negro violates the self-sacrificial character of Christian love. In responding to the needs of another, love dictates that one's own needs and wants must be sacrificed if necessary. At no

¹Harvey Seifert and Frank E. Shuler, "The Church and Human Relations," from a report on the Methodist Conference on Human Relations, Aug. 31 to Sept. 4, 1959, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, sec. 1, p. 3.

other point does the love norm encounter more difficulty. Persons who favor residential segregation often do so on the basis of protecting their property values. The manner in which church members are prone to thus justify their support of residential segregation led one man to comment:

I'm one of the Deerfield residents who has everything he owns wrapped up in his house. Everybody worries about the economic aspects of this thing. The talk makes me wonder if we shouldn't open the banks instead of the churches in Deerfield on Sunday mornings.¹

Christian love involves a response to need. Racial residential segregation violates this characteristic as well. The need of Negroes to live in the kinds of neighborhoods which will help them to realize their fullest potential as children of God is denied, ignored or deemed unimportant. A lack of sensitivity and a spirit of indifference are often manifested by the majority group. While not as flagrant a denial of love as that made, say, by an ardent white supremacist, this attitude effectively impedes the flow of love which the situation requires.

Racial residential segregation also violates the reconciling aspect of Christian love. Not only has God in Christ reconciled the world to himself, he calls men to become reconciled to one another as well:

So, if you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against

¹Harry M. and David H. Rosen, But Not Next Door (New York: Ivan Obolensky, Inc., 1962), pp. 40-41.

you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift.¹

Right relationship to God is dependent upon right relationship to one's brother man. Divine love for man requires man's love for the Divine and for man. If man rejects relationship with his fellow man he is not ready for relationship with his God.²

The Community Ethic

Gardner writes of community:

The purpose of God in the creation of man, therefore, is seen to be the creation of individual persons who may mutually nourish and complete each other in the manifold relationships of life in community. Responsibility to God on the part of the single individual involves responsibility for the members of the community of which one is a part, and in biblical thought this community becomes increasingly the universal community symbolized by the kingdom of God.³

Racial residential segregation fractures the bonds of community. Artificial, quasi-communities are created by it. It is an "immoral separation of people from people."⁴ Persons are not segregated because they have committed crimes, because they are emotionally ill, or for other sufficient cause - they are segregated because of the basically irrelevant consideration of race. Haselden puts

¹Matthew 5:23-24.

²I John 4:20.

³Gardner, op. cit., p. 132.

⁴Haselden, op. cit., p. 121.

it pungently:

Racial segregation falls under this judgment and under no other. It is evil for the simple reason that it severs a person or a people from those to whom they belong on the basis of capricious, arbitrary, and irrelevant considerations of race. In the mind of the segregationist, minor and superficial human distinctions are accounted sufficient to warrant the rupture of major and basic human identities."¹

The possibilities for true community and fellowship are non-existent when the walls of racial residential segregation are thrown up. Communication, social intercourse, and interaction are severely restricted. Men are hindered in any attempt to come into meaningful relationship with one another.

The inclusive community has many forces ranged against it. Handlin notes that even those persons in the community who favor residential integration sense about them a desire for a secure community, and one in which congeniality is seen as an index of that security. There is moreover a longing for uniformity that militates against residential integration.²

Abrams has pointed out that one of the chief fears of the average white homeowner who sees a minority group begin to move into his neighborhood is the fear of loss of neighborhood associations. He is afraid many of his neighbors will leave and he is anxious about the changes he

¹Ibid.

²Handlin, op. cit., p. 91.

believes this will effect in the school, the church, friendship patterns for himself and his children, and in other neighborhood institutions and groups.¹ Hence, out of a loyalty to and security in a partial community he often opposes the advent of a more inclusive community. At the same time it is clear man can achieve what God intends for him only through the inclusive community. The ethic of self-realization assumes this kind of community as its base.²

Racial residential segregation is an example of one of man's attempts to flout the divine law of mankind's basic unity. This attempt at separating men at one level of life cannot succeed in dissolving their spiritual oneness. But it can and does place tremendous strains upon their relationships.

The Doctrine of Man

In the Christian view man has been created in the image of God. However, through his sin, man alienates himself from God and divests himself of his higher spiritual qualities. In this state man is capable of great evil. But God offers man his love and forgiveness and thereby creates the possibility for man to replace evil with good in his life.

¹Abrams, op. cit., p. 262.

²Walter G. Muelder, Foundations of the Responsible Society (New York: Abingdon Press, 1959) p. 24.

Hence, God has created man as a free being who has within him capacity for both evil and good. The manner in which man relates himself to his God, through his freedom, largely determines the orientation of his life - toward the good, or toward the evil. Man's freedom is not absolute. But in his finiteness man has significant moral freedom.

It is a natural outgrowth of the Christian doctrine of man that each man should be treated with the dignity and respect worthy of a child of God. Each human personality is invested with an essential worth which cannot be taken from it. It follows, then, that no man should be confronted with arbitrary restrictions which hinder him in realizing his highest potentialities.

The norms of freedom, justice, and equality follow logically from the Christian understanding of man. These have a special relevance to the problem of racial residential segregation. If a man is arbitrarily prevented from living in a neighborhood of his own choice by reason of his race, his freedom is thereby abrogated. There are other types of residential segregation, such as that imposed by limitation of one's income. However, this type of segregation can be escaped by a rise in economic status. The same does not apply for racial residential segregation. It is a deprivation of freedom in that it is enforced upon a group for the irrelevant consideration of race - and this is a consideration which the deprived group has no opportunity

to alter.

Man is to be accorded justice. Muelder holds:

Negatively, justice delineates principles to restrain evil and the evildoer. Positively justice formulates the political and economic skeletal structure of society which carries the organic element of the community.¹

Racial residential segregation violates both the negative and positive functions of justice. Where this type of segregation exists evil has not been restrained by justice. Moreover, the political skeletal structure of society lacks some of the bones which would guarantee racial justice. Ramsey notes the strong biblical emphasis on need as the measure of God's righteousness toward the individual. In racial residential segregation the real needs of the minority group are disregarded.²

The norm of equality is done violence by the practice of racial residential segregation. In defining equality Muelder says:

Equality relates to rights, that is, to civil liberties and civil rights. Fundamentally it is not so much a quantitative ideal as a spiritual principle. It is the claim which personal worth makes in every social situation, institution, and condition. The equality which is an absolute claim and a constant in both justice and freedom is the claim of spiritual dignity by the person.³

¹Ibid., p. 31.

²Ramsey, Basic Christian Ethics, op. cit., p. 14.

³Muelder, op. cit., p. 33.

Christian faith holds that each man shares equally in the love and concern God has for humanity. This seems to have been basic to Jesus' view of man as recorded in the Gospels. Racial or religious background was unimportant to him as he ministered to human need.¹ This is seen in such instances as the parable of the Good Samaritan² and in Jesus' commendation of the faith of the Roman centurion.³ In Acts 10:34-35 Peter says: "Truly I perceive that God shows no partiality, but in every nation any one who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him." In one of Paul's great letters is found these words: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus."⁴ A lengthy list of biblical quotations relating explicitly or implicitly to the equality of men before God could be compiled. But the point is this: man is not justified in investing any group of men with inferior or superior inherent worth when the Father of all men has invested them with equal worth.

Racial residential segregation implies inferiority of the excluded group. It says to this group that they are

¹Georgia Harkness, Christian Ethics (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 166.

²Luke 10:30-37.

³Matthew 8:10-13.

⁴Galatians 3:28.

not sufficiently worthy to live with the majority group. It says to them that they are not the equals of the majority group.

The norm of equality is closely related to the Christian principle of each man's inherent dignity. Racial residential segregation violates this principle as well. Martin Luther King, Jr., discusses his painful experiences in childhood and as a teenager as he was confronted by segregation and the "separate but equal" doctrine. He notes that the separate was always unequal and, significantly, "the very idea of separation did something to my sense of dignity and self-respect."¹

In racial residential segregation Negroes see an attack on their dignity as persons. Hans J. Morgenthau is quoted approvingly by E. Franklin Frazier of Howard University in his view that the most important factor in the relations between white and colored races the world around is the deep yearning on the part of colored people for "freedom from contempt."²

¹Martin Luther King, Stride toward Freedom (New York: Harper & Bros., 1958), p. 21.

²E. Franklin Frazier, Race and Culture Contacts in the Modern World (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957), p. 325.

Racial Residential Segregation as Challenged
by the Christian Understanding of the
Basic Institutions of Society

Important functions of the basic institutions of society stand in opposition to the practice of racial residential segregation, as these institutions are viewed from a Christian perspective.

The Family

One of the primary functions of the family is the provision of conditions which make for the optimum development of the personalities of the children in the family.¹ Crippling restrictions are placed on parents who try to perform this function if they do it within the framework of the ghetto which residential segregation so often creates. A perceptive Negro writer, James Baldwin, comments on the impact of life in the Negro ghetto:

They work in the white man's world all day and come home in the evening to this fetid block. They struggle to instill in their children some private sense of honor or dignity which will help the child to survive. This means, of course, that they must struggle stolidly, incessantly, to keep this sense alive in themselves, in spite of the insult, the indifference and the cruelty they are certain to encounter in their working day. They patiently browbeat the landlord into fixing the heat, the plaster, the plumbing; this demands prodigious patience; nor is patience usually enough. In trying to make their hovels habitable, they are perpetually throwing good money after bad. Such frustration, so long endured, is driving many strong, admirable men and women whose only crime is color to the very gates

¹Muelder, op. cit., p. 55.

of paranoia.¹

Even if a Negro family lives in one of the pleasanter Negro residential areas which are found in some communities, and which do not bear the more obvious marks of social ill health found typically in the slum-ghetto, it is still impossible for that family to create the conditions for the optimum development of their children's personalities. The majority of their children's social contacts naturally tend to be confined to their own segregated community. This denies them the opportunity for beneficial interaction with children of the majority group and with many of the institutions of the majority group. More often than not, the majority has had cultural and educational opportunities of a higher quality than the Negro group which could be shared with them to their benefit. It is likewise true that the majority group suffers from the influences of racial residential segregation:

In a real sense a neighborhood inhabited only by members of a single denomination, occupation, class, or race may not be the most desirable neighborhood to live in. It is relatively poverty stricken in that it provides a meager opportunity for contact with worthy representatives of other cultures. It means less opportunity for personal growth through cultural enrichment. It blights the full possibilities of brotherhood.²

In much the same way, parents who raise their fami-

¹Baldwin, op. cit., pp. 59-60.

²Seifert, op. cit., p. 3.

lies in racially segregated residential areas are heavily handicapped in educating their children for adult roles. Children learn by precept and example, as well as by doing. In a segregated society a Negro parent may be able to supply the precepts for teaching a child his adult role. But if he wants to prepare his child for life in the more open, inclusive, democratic society he hopes for, he is severely limited in the provision of examples and "learning-by-doing" experiences. The racially segregated neighborhood normally takes unto itself segregated community institutions, and it is here that most of the life experiences outside of the home will take place.

The Christian family which seeks to educate its children in the deepest meanings of its faith cannot fully succeed in the segregated community. One cannot teach as effectively the ethic of community and the norm of Christian love if children are not privileged to have normal associations that run the gamut of community life with persons of different racial backgrounds. Again, relationship is a prerequisite for real love.

The Negro family living in a racially segregated residential area finds that the walls built up against them are not only barriers to its horizontal movement, but these walls become a ceiling as well - a ceiling on aspiration, opportunity, and achievement.

The Economic Order

Economic institutions are those which deal with the management of the household of culture so that relative "scarce means" may be best used to satisfy needs and wants.¹

For a multiplicity of reasons the economic order in the United States has failed to satisfy the need and the desire of the Negro for adequate housing. Representatives of the economic order, such as realtors, the house building industry, and mortgage institutions, have played a prominent role in the development and perpetuation of racial residential segregation.²

The economic order has been slow to admit Negroes to other than unskilled employment. This has helped to keep him in a disadvantaged economic position. The great majority of Negroes could not afford to purchase homes in middle income white residential neighborhoods even if allowed to. Moreover, the minority of Negroes who could afford it suffer from the poor image of the Negro as property maintainer resulting from Negroes' low income and restriction to the generally inadequate housing found in the ghetto.

McEntire comments:

Because of low income, most minority families can afford only the cheaper dwellings. But their housing is poorer than it need be on the basis of price alone.

¹Muelder, op. cit., p. 63.

²McEntire, op. cit., p. 348.

Segregation tends to create a special scarcity of housing for the segregated groups, enabling higher prices to be charged than in the general market for similar dwellings. Nonwhite families, on the average, obtain less space and a poorer quality of dwellings than do white families, even when they pay the same rents or purchase prices.¹

In the end, Christianity judges any economic order by the success with which it meets basic human needs. Today the one commodity the Negro in the United States cannot buy freely in the market place is decent, unsegregated housing. There can be no question but that the need for the right kind of shelter is a very basic human need.

The State

In discussing the nature of the state Brunner sees it to be partially the outgrowth of irrational, inevitable forces. However, he also holds:

But it is no less true that the state is a manifestation of spiritual forces and purposes, the bearer of culture, the guardian of justice and of human values against arbitrary violence, and the creator of community in a human society which would otherwise dissolve into atoms.²

The maintenance of order and the promotion of justice are prominent functions of the state. There have been places and occasions where the state was unwilling or unable to even maintain order when racial residential segre-

¹Ibid., p. 348.

²Brunner, op. cit., p. 443.

gation was challenged.¹ Vandalism and terrorism have forced many a Negro family from a newly entered dwelling in a predominantly white residential area. However, it is in its role as dispenser of justice that the state comes under its most searching criticism from the Christian faith. This applies particularly to distributive justice rather than to retributive justice.

Until comparatively recently when court decisions against restrictive covenants (1948 and 1953) and against the principle of "separate but equal" (May 17, 1954) began to redress the imbalance, the weight of the state in this nation had been on the side of those who favored the institution and retention of racial residential segregation. The Federal Housing Administration played a key role in this. Its policies helped create the pattern of racial residential segregation that is currently so widespread.²

The state has not only the function of meting out justice, but also of defining justice.³ It had largely failed in both respects in regard to the rights of Negroes to unsegregated, decent housing. Fortunately for Negroes, however, this aspect of racial justice has been undergoing

¹Abrams, op. cit., pp. 82-90.

²Long, op. cit., pp. 72ff.; Abrams, op. cit., pp. 229-37; Handlin, op. cit., p. 81; Weaver, op. cit., pp. 69ff.; Vose, op. cit., pp. 225-27.

³Muelder, op. cit., p. 62.

redefinition in recent years. In 1950 the FHA ceased insuring properties which were affected by race restrictive covenants. In 1962 came President Kennedy's momentous executive order ending FHA and Veterans Administration assistance to segregated housing.¹ Moreover, in the last decade, many states and cities have adopted legislation banning discrimination in housing, employment, and other fields.²

Education

The educational processes in society cannot be restricted to formal schooling. Even today the family remains as the most significant educational agent. However, it cannot be denied that in modern society formal education has become one of the crucial and basic institutions of culture.

In a sense, formal school education is a transitional institution standing midway between the family and the adult world into which the child enters. This institution is invaluable in preparing persons to move out from the primary group into the life of secondary groups.³ Racial residential segregation has produced de facto school segregation across large parts of our nation where other-

¹U.S., President (Kennedy), op. cit.

²McEntire, op. cit., p. 278.

³Muelder, op. cit., p. 59ff.

wise there is no policy of segregation in education. In most communities the population of the public schools, particularly at the elementary level, is made up of those children living in the neighborhood of the school. Where racial residential segregation has produced a predominantly or all Negro community, the public school normally reflects the population make-up.

Closely related to the community's expectation that the school will prepare children for life in the adult world is the expectation of the Christian faith that educational institutions will aid children in the quest for self-realization. A child requires the best education in order to reach his highest potential. Segregated schools have produced inferior educational experiences for children of minority groups almost without fail. At the same time and for the same reason children of minority group members are not equally prepared to participate in the adult world.

The Church

Christianity's conception of the Church challenges the practice of racial residential segregation. Such Christian ethical principles as those of community and the all-inclusive character of love are again seen to have relevance here. However, the most distinct affront to the Church which racial residential segregation presents is made manifest in its violation of the all-inclusive nature

of the fellowship of the Church itself: "for you are all one in Christ Jesus."¹ This passage is related in spirit to Paul's concept of the Church as the body of Christ found in such passages as I Cor. 12:4-27: "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it."² Racial residential segregation makes for racially divided churches. Racially divided churches represent a division in the body of Christ.

The great majority of American churches draw their memberships from residential areas relatively near the church site. It follows that churches not having Negroes in close residential proximity to them will not normally have Negroes represented in their memberships. This problem is sometimes overlooked by those persons in the Church who hope to see it become an inclusive fellowship. Here and there an isolated church becomes inclusive, though often it is a mere token integration. Occasionally a church in a changing neighborhood welcomes the incoming Negro group. However, if the neighborhood follows the all too frequent pattern of becoming in time predominantly Negro, the church usually takes on the corresponding racial proportions.

There have been instances where churches have actually sought to promote racial residential segregation.

¹Galatians 3:28.

²I Corinthians 12:27.

Long and Johnson write of a Methodist Church in St. Louis, Missouri, which in 1922 signed a racially restrictive housing covenant for the purpose of keeping Negroes out of its neighborhood. In 1942 when a Negro family contested the agreement the pastor of the church "gave testimony supporting the racial restriction and sided with the Real Estate Exchange in its efforts to oust the (Negro) family from its home."¹ The same authors tell of two Catholic priests who in 1942 led efforts to exclude Negroes from residential areas in their Philadelphia and Buffalo parishes.² In 1949 the City of Chicago Commission on Human Relations reported that some religious institutions had been active in a general campaign to halt Negro immigration into white residential areas.³

In discussing the reaction of local churches to Negro immigration Abrams notes:

In a few cases, officials of the local church, sometimes wearing its vestments, have led the fight against the incoming minority. But in other cases church leaders have checked hasty action, and brought about understanding between newcomers and older residents. By constructive leadership areas have been stabilized and panicky residents persuaded that the immigration is no signal for them to pack up and flee."⁴

¹Long, op. cit., p. 82.

²Ibid., p. 83.

³Report of the Commission on Human Relations, City of Chicago, Dec. 10, 1949, p. 16 (mimeographed), quoted in Abrams, op. cit., p. 186.

⁴Abrams, op. cit., p. 263.

There have been some instances of religious institutions' taking a forthright stand against racial residential segregation. In the crucial 1948 Supreme Court test case relating to enforcement of racially restrictive covenants at least two prominent church groups filed briefs in support of those who held such enforcement illegal. These were the Protestant Council of the City of New York and the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States.¹ The American Friends Service Committee has a community relations program in several metropolitan areas which seeks to promote racial residential integration. In Minneapolis, Minnesota, there is an interfaith fair housing program with a full-time director and staff.

In Philadelphia in 1953 three religious groups - an Episcopalian church, a Unitarian church, and a Jewish Center formed a church community council which had good success in dealing with problems created by Negro migration into their community. The council did much to gain an attitude of acceptance for the Negroes and discourage questionable practices among real estate agents.²

Though they were slow in getting underway with such pronouncements, the major Protestant denominations are now

¹Ibid., pp. 220-21.

²Chester Rapkin and William G. Grigsby, The Demand for Housing in Racially-Mixed Areas (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), p. 136.

on record in favor of integration in all aspects of national life, including housing. (Only the Congregationalists and the American Baptists had taken a stand against all segregation by the 1930's and it was not until 1946 that the Federal Council of Churches spoke out against segregation in race relations "as unnecessary and undesirable and a violation of human brotherhood.")¹ Women's groups such as the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church have educational programs in the fair housing field, as do the social action and education agencies of several of the major Protestant denominations.

In spite of the above mentioned efforts, and others similar to them that doubtless exist, the total impact of Protestantism in the U.S. on the problem of racial residential segregation must be set down as negligible. What C. Eric Lincoln has written of the general aspirations of the Negro for intergration into our society applies as well to the role played by the church in racial residential segregation; he says the Negro "is receiving no significant support from any powerful factor of the white community."²

What Waldo Beach has written about the failure of the churches to be the conscience of the community in race relations generally is also applicable to the specific

¹Haselden, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

²Lincoln, op. cit., p. 253.

problem of racial residential segregation:

Out of comfort, fear, and blindness the churches have for the most part capitulated to the segregation and prejudice of the world, and have become salt without savor.¹

¹Beach, loc. cit., p. 218.

CHAPTER IV

RELATED STUDIES AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In the search for related studies extensive use was made of the traditional sources such as abstracts of dissertations and sociological works, and indices to periodical literature. Particularly helpful was a special bibliography prepared by the Commission on Race and Housing in 1960.¹ (The Commission is an independent, private citizens' group, financed by a grant from the Fund for the Republic.) The writer also corresponded with more than a score of intergroup relations organizations, agencies of church denominations, and universities in search of pertinent studies. Valuable information was obtained from several of these, including the New York University Research Center for Human Relations, The National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Greater Minneapolis Interfaith Fair Housing Program, and Professor Robert W. Friedrichs of the Sociology Department at Drew University.

¹McEntire, op. cit., pp. 381-400.

General Attitudes toward Racial

Residential Segregation

In the thirty-year period extending from 1926 to 1956 eight nation-wide surveys were conducted which sought to determine attitudes toward living in interracial neighborhoods.¹ Since these studies were not coordinated with one another, various types of questions relating to willingness to reside in racially mixed neighborhoods were asked and a variety of responses were produced. Nevertheless:

Although the proportions of pro- and anti-segregation answers vary according to the wording of the questions, they fall within a range which is narrow enough to permit reliable estimates of the proportion of the population which expresses approval of integration or willingness to accept it.²

In a 1926 study Bogardus found whites overwhelmingly opposed to the entry of non-whites into white residential neighborhoods. Eighty-eight per cent of the respondents expressed opposition to Negroes' residing on their street as neighbors.³ The 1,725 persons questioned in this study were drawn from all parts of the nation, but younger age groups, the middle class, and the more highly educated were over-represented in the sample. Hence, the

¹New York University, Research Center for Human Relations, "How People Feel and Act about Interracial Housing," (1957), p. 3.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 4, citing Emory S. Bogardus, Immigration and Race Attitudes (Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1928), pp. 23-26.

findings should probably be interpreted as a minimum position of opposition to racial residential integration.¹

In 1939 Roper conducted a nationwide survey for Fortune magazine. It found that 83 per cent of white Americans favored racial residential segregation.²

In 1942 a national sample was asked: "If a Negro with just as much income and education as you have moved into your block, would it make any difference to you?" The proportion answering "Yes" was 62 per cent.³ It is interesting to note that in this same study 84 per cent of the respondents indicated they thought there should be separate sections in towns and cities for Negroes to live in.

Also in 1942 four national samples of labor groups were asked which of a specified list of minority groups they would least like to see move into a vacant house in their neighborhood. The proportion in the four samples who named Negroes as the people they would least like to see move in ranged from 60 to 75 per cent. The figures varied with the labor category. The proportions indicating it

¹Ibid., p. 4.

²Ibid., p. 5, citing Eugene L. Horowitz, "'Race' Attitudes," in Otto Klineberg (ed.), Characteristics of the American Negro (New York: Harper & Bros., 1944), pp. 203-204; and letter from Beverly Griswold, Secretary to Elmo Roper, New York, June 5, 1956.

³Ibid., citing unpublished tabulations contained in letter from Richard D. Johnson, Librarian, National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Illinois, March 28, 1956.

would make no difference to them (which kind of people listed moved in) ranged from 11 to 20 per cent.¹

In 1944 the National Opinion Research Center asked a nationwide sample: "Would it make any difference to you if a Negro family moved next door to you?" Answering "Yes" were 69 per cent.²

In a 1948 nation-wide survey 62 per cent of white adults queried said they would prefer not to have Negroes move into their neighborhood to live.³

The most recent nationwide polls regarding attitudes toward racial residential segregation were conducted during 1955 and 1956. Ben Gaffin and Associates conducted such a poll during December, 1955 and January, 1956.⁴ The National Opinion Research Center conducted its poll during April, 1956.⁵ These independent studies utilized different

¹Ibid., citing letter from Griswold, loc. cit.

²Ibid., citing letter from Johnson, loc. cit.

³Ibid., p. 6, citing Elmo Roper, tabulation for "A Study of Anti-Minority Sentiment in the United States," prepared for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, New York, 1948. (Unpublished.)

⁴Ibid., citing Ben Gaffin & Assoc., Inc. (141 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.), detailed tables, Vol. II, prepared for "How to Solve Our Race Problem," Catholic Digest, (June - Dec., 1956).

⁵Ibid., citing Herbert H. Hyman and Paul B. Sheatsley, "Attitudes toward Desegregation," Scientific American, CXCIV, no. 6, 35-39.

national samples. The findings were remarkably similar. Those who accepted and those who rejected racially mixed neighborhoods were almost evenly divided. The Gaffin study found that 52 per cent of the white Americans questioned said that they would be willing to live in the same general neighborhood with Negroes. The National Opinion Research Center study reported that 51 per cent of its sample of white Americans said that it would not make any difference to them if a Negro with the same income and education as they moved into their block.

In the Gaffin study this figure rises to 59 per cent when only northern respondents are considered. In the National Opinion Research Center study the figure rises to 58 per cent for northern respondents only.¹

These eight nation-wide surveys spanning the years 1926 to 1956 evidence a clear trend toward a greater degree of readiness on the part of white Americans to accept racial residential integration.

New York University's Research Center for Human Relations has analyzed twenty studies of attitudes toward the same problem which were conducted at the community level. These studies were carried out between 1944 and 1956 and were concentrated in large cities in three principal sections of the nation - the Pacific Coast, the Midwest,

¹Ibid., p. 16, citing Gaffin, loc. cit., and Hyman, loc. cit.

and the Northeast.¹

It is speculated that these may include in their number several which were situations of inter-racial tension, in view of the fact that such situations frequently draw the attention of investigators. In the studies covering the period from 1944 to 1952 the white respondents who favored residential segregation ranged from two thirds to three quarters of the total. However, in the five studies conducted between 1953 and 1956 the proportion favoring residential segregation took a marked drop. In one of these studies only one third of the respondents expressed opposition to having Negro neighbors. In two others those expressing opposition fell between one half and two thirds. The remaining two studies were difficult to classify but it was clear in each of them that the proportion favoring segregation was less than two thirds.

In these twenty community studies there did not appear to be pronounced regional variations in views about residential segregation. Six studies in the Pacific Coast area (Washington and northern California) showed a median of 63 per cent of the respondents favoring residential segregation. Six studies in the Midwest (Minnesota, Michigan, and Illinois) showed an identical median of 63 per cent. Ten studies in northeastern states (Pennsylvania, New Jer-

¹Ibid., pp. 13-19.

sey, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island) showed a median of 55 per cent favoring residential segregation.

The Relationship between Religion and Prejudice

Many investigators have noted a direct relationship between prejudice and conventional religious activity.¹

Adorno in The Authoritarian Personality reported that the persons in their study who rejected religion and the church were less prejudiced than those who were deemed to be religious. However, they did note that a minority within the religious group who seemed to have "internalized" their religion were not high in prejudice.²

Allport and Kramer found in a study of over 400 college students that those who reported that religion had been a marked or moderate influence in their upbringing were far higher in prejudice than those who indicated that religion was a slight or non-existent influence.³

Holtzman found in a study of 546 male students at a Texas university that non-church goers ranked highest in pro-integration attitudes. However, he also noted the

¹Simpson, op. cit., p. 108; Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, op. cit., pp. 450-51.

²Adorno, op. cit., pp. 208-20 and 742-43.

³Gordon W. Allport and Bernard M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," Journal of Psychology, XXII (1946), 9-39.

existence of a curvilinear relationship between frequency of church attendance and tolerance. The greater tolerance occurred at both ends of the continuum. Those who attended church regularly and those who never attended were higher in tolerance than the group whose attendance ranged from a few times per year to about twice a month.¹

In a North Carolina study Tumin concluded that church attendance is relatively unimportant in shaping attitudes toward segregation. It can be seen from his data, however, that a curvilinear relationship exists between church attendance and favorable attitudes toward the Negro and integration on the four of the five measurement scales he employs. Again, those who attend church most frequently and those who never attend have the most favorable attitudes.²

In some studies religion has come off a bit better. Bettelheim and Janowitz, in their study of Chicago veterans, found a significant positive correlation between religion and tolerance.³

In another place the authors state that the type of religion held by the individual is all important. They

¹Holtzman, op. cit., p. 566.

²Melvin M. Tumin, Desegregation (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1958), pp. 64-68.

³Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz, Dynamics of Prejudice (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950), p. 51.

speak of "stable" religious convictions being most highly associated with tolerance.¹ Those who have "internalized" their religion tend to be tolerant, while those who have not are less tolerant:

If the moral teachings of the church are accepted by the individual not through fear of damnation or of societal disapproval but because he considers them absolute standards of behavior independent of external threats or approval, then we say that the individual has "internalized" these moral precepts.²

In a 1959 study in a Los Angeles suburb Rosenblum found an inverse relationship between religiosity and prejudice. He measured religiosity by church attendance and attitudes toward the institution of the church. He found that, in general, persons in his study designated as "religious" were less prejudiced than those considered "nonreligious." He did find exceptions, however. Among the Roman Catholic and Lutheran groups the less religious the respondents were, the less likely they were to be prejudiced. He concluded from this that a strict orthodox type of adherence is conducive to more strongly prejudiced attitudes.³

In this latter connection it is worthy of note that in studies to determine whether Protestants or Roman Catho-

¹B. Bettelheim and M. Janowitz, "Ethnic Tolerance: A Function of Social and Personal Control," American Journal of Sociology, LV (1949), 142.

²Ibid., p. 141.

³Rosenblum, op. cit., pp. 105-123, 186.

lics are more prejudiced the results have proved equivocal. In some studies one group is higher in prejudice, in other studies the reverse is true, and some find no difference.¹

Allport reports a study in which two groups of church members were selected in both a Catholic and a Baptist church.² One group in each church was chosen because they were considered persons "whose faith really meant something." The other group in each church was chosen because they were considered to be "influenced more by political and social aspects of religious activities." The same results occurred in both churches. The "devout" group showed far less prejudice than the other. In interpretation Allport says:

Belonging to a church because it is a safe, powerful, superior in-group is likely to be the mark of an authoritarian character and to be linked with prejudice. Belonging to a church because its basic creed of brotherhood expresses the ideals one sincerely believes in, is associated with tolerance. Thus, the "institutionalized" religious outlook and the "interiorized" religious outlook have opposite effects in the personality.³

¹Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, op. cit., p. 449.

²Ibid., p. 452.

³Ibid., p. 453.

Church Members' Attitudes toward
Racial Residential Segregation

The writer's research has uncovered only two studies which questioned church members, per se, on their attitudes toward residential segregation of the Negro.

In a 1958 survey of 750 persons in Detroit, Michigan, designed to study the impact of religion on politics, economics, and family life, one question related to racially mixed neighborhoods. White respondents were asked if they would be "at all disturbed or unhappy" if a Negro with the same income and education moved into their block.¹ The proportion of Protestants indicating that they would be disturbed or unhappy about it was 53 per cent. The figure for Catholics was 58 per cent and for Jews only 19 per cent. Interestingly, Lensky found that middle class respondents were more likely to be disturbed or unhappy about this situation than were those in the working class. In the former, 56 per cent of the Protestants expressed concern, 67 per cent of the Catholics, and only 16 per cent of the Jews. Figures for the working class were, respectively, 50, 52, and 25 per cent.

The writer has found only one study which deals with church members' attitudes toward residential segregation of the Negro in any depth. In 1959 Friedrichs studied

¹Lensky, op. cit., p. 65.

attitudes toward residential and educational segregation in a New Jersey residential community within commuting distance of New York City.¹ Of the 112 persons interviewed, 103 identified themselves as members of some church.

In the Friedrichs study a person was considered "tolerant" if he gave a negative response to the following question: "I would object to a Negro family moving into this neighborhood."² Of the Protestants, 43 per cent were found to be "tolerant" (57 per cent would object to Negroes moving in). Of the Catholics, 48 per cent were found to be "tolerant" (52 per cent would object to Negroes moving in). This study also found a curvilinear relationship between frequency of church attendance and tolerance, and produced some interesting findings in the relationship between tolerance and the role the member takes in his church.³ The relevant findings of Friedrich's study are considered in more detail in Chapter VI.

In Chapter VI studies related to many of the variables involved in the present study are noted in the discussion of the relationship of these variables to tolerance

¹Robert W. Friedrichs, "Christians and Residential Exclusion," The Journal of Social Issues, XV, No. 4 (1959).

²Questionnaire enclosed in letter from Robert W. Friedrichs, Professor, Sociology Department, Drew University, Madison, New Jersey, Sept. 4, 1962.

³Friedrichs, "Christians and Residential Exclusion," op. cit., pp. 18-20.

of Negro residential proximity.

CHAPTER V

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Comparison of Church Members' Attitudes in Integrated and Segregated Neighborhoods

A mean "tolerance of Negro residential proximity score" (hereafter usually abbreviated to "tolerance score") was computed for the 266 respondents in the 9 churches located in neighborhoods where Negroes did not reside, and the 26 in the two churches in neighborhoods where Negroes did reside. The mean tolerance score for the former was 13.6 and for the latter it was 18. The statistical test of the difference between two means indicates that this difference is significant at the one tenth of 1 per cent level. However, it should be noted that the 26 respondents in the second group do constitute a small number. It is, therefore, difficult to make extensive generalizations about this group. Nevertheless, it appears that those persons in the study who are members of churches in racially integrated neighborhoods do have significantly more tolerant attitudes toward Negro residential proximity than do those persons who are members of churches in racially segregated neighborhoods.

Table 5 shows the number and percentage of each of the two church groups which fall in the four separate divisions of the "tolerance of Negro residential proximity scale" (hereafter usually abbreviated to "Tolerance Scale"). It is observed that 42.3 per cent of those in the 2 churches are in the highest division (Tolerant) on the Tolerance Scale, as compared with only 26.3 per cent of those from the 9 churches. Conversely, only 15.4 per cent of those from the 2 churches are in the lowest division (Very Intolerant) on the Tolerance Scale, as compared with 36.1 per cent of those from the 9 churches.

Since the number of respondents from the 2 churches in integrated neighborhoods is so small (26), statistical analysis of that group is not feasible. Moreover, this study is primarily concerned with attitudes of those respondents who are members of churches located in neighborhoods where no Negroes reside. Consequently, little analysis of the data obtained from respondents in the 2 churches will occur in the remainder of the dissertation.

It is observed from this brief comparison of the two groups, though, that some support is gained for the hypothesis that experience in living in racially mixed neighborhoods is directly related to favorable attitudes toward living in such neighborhoods. The difference in the two mean tolerance scores is considerable. The score of 13.6 places the 266 respondents from the 9 churches in the

TABLE 5
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS FROM CHURCHES IN
INTEGRATED AND SEGREGATED NEIGHBORHOODS BY DIVISIONS
OF TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY SCALE

Respondents	Mean Tolerance Score	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Totals	
		Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage
Segregated ^a	13.6	70	26.3	52	19.5	48	18.0	96	36.1	266	99.9
Integrated ^b	18.0	11	42.3	8	30.7	3	11.5	4	15.4	26	99.9

Test of the Difference between Two Means: $Z = 7.76$; $p = < .001$

^aRespondents from churches in segregated neighborhoods.

^bRespondents from churches in integrated neighborhoods.

"Intolerant" division of the Tolerance Scale. The score of 18 achieved by the 26 respondents from the 2 churches puts them in the "Mildly Intolerant" division of the Tolerance Scale.

It is not possible, of course, to know to what extent a selective process has been at work in earlier eliminating (through flight) those persons in the neighborhoods of the two integrated churches who were most intolerant. That is, to some extent, those who remain in the church and the neighborhood may be those persons who were originally most tolerant of Negro residential proximity.

General Attitudes Toward Negro Residential Proximity

The findings discussed in this section relate to the 266 respondents from the 9 churches located in neighborhoods where Negroes do not reside. This study is focused on this group of respondents. Throughout most of the study the tolerance score and position of respondents on the Tolerance Scale are used as the bases for analyzing the findings. However, in this section some attention is also given to the individual questions from which each respondent's tolerance score is derived, as well as to some other questions.

Table 6 shows the respondents' attitudes toward Negroes of similar education and income moving into the neighborhood and moving next door. It also shows something

TABLE 6
ATTITUDES TOWARD NEGROES MOVING INTO THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND NEXT DOOR

Negroes Moving into Neighborhood and Next Door	Strongly Disapprove		Mildly Disapprove		Would Be Undecided		Mildly Approve		Strongly Approve	
	Number	Per- centage ^a	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage
If a Negro family of similar education and income to neighbors moved into neighborhood, neighbors would.....	169	63.5	61	22.9	22	8.3	4	1.5	0	0.0
If a Negro family of similar education and income moved into neighborhood, respondent would.....	82	30.8	56	21.1	47	17.7	57	21.4	24	9.1

^aPercentages do not total 100 per cent because of a few respondents who did not answer all the questions.

TABLE 6 --Continued

Negroes Moving into Neighborhood and Next Door	Strongly Disapprove		Mildly Disapprove		Would Be Undecided		Mildly Approve		Strongly Approve	
	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage
If a Negro family of similar education and income moved in next door to a typical neighbor, that neighbor would.....	186	69.9	42	15.8	21	7.9	7	2.6	0	0.0
If a Negro family of similar education and income moved in next door to respondent he would.....	101	38.0	38	14.3	60	22.6	41	15.4	25	9.4

of what the respondents perceive their neighbors' attitudes to be on the same questions.

It is noted that 30.8 per cent of the respondents indicate they would strongly disapprove of such a Negro family moving into their neighborhood, and 21.1 per cent indicate mild disapproval. This total figure of 51.9 per cent who register disapproval does not compare favorably with results of the most recent nationwide studies. In these studies by Ben Gaffin & Associates¹ and the National Opinion Research Center² the proportion of white respondents in the North and West who would be willing to have Negroes living in their neighborhoods were 59 and 58 per cent, respectively. It is worthy of note, however, that in the Gaffin study the lower age limit for those included in the sample was 15. In the present study, if we add the 17.7 per cent who are undecided to the 30.5 per cent who register some degree of approval of a Negro family moving into their neighborhood, we still have only 48.2 per cent who do not register actual disapproval.

The respondents in the present study compare more favorably with studies conducted in five communities between 1953 and 1956. The New York University Research

¹New York University, op. cit., p. 16, citing Gaffin, loc. cit.

²Ibid., citing Hyman, loc. cit.

Center for Human Relations reports on these studies and indicates it is difficult to classify them.¹ However, it seems clear that in at least four of these five studies the proportion favoring residential segregation is closer to the figures found in the present study than to those reported by Ben Gaffin & Associates and by the National Opinion Research Center. Little is known about the circumstances of these studies, though. It is possible that they were conducted in times of racial crisis. On the other hand, since they were conducted in urban areas, it is possible that urban residents (who are more likely to be faced with the possibility of Negro residential proximity) are less tolerant in their attitudes toward Negro residential proximity than residents of rural and other non-metropolitan areas.

In the two studies of white church members known to the writer, the respondents appear to have attitudes similar to those found in the present study. Lensky, in his 1958 Detroit study, reports 53 per cent of the white Protestants indicated they would be disturbed or unhappy if a Negro family with the same education or income moved into their block. This compares with the 51.9 per cent in the present study who register disapproval of a similar Negro family moving into their neighborhood. Friedrichs, in his

¹Ibid., pp. 13-19.

²Lensky, op. cit., p. 65.

1959 study of a suburban New Jersey residential community, found 45 per cent of the white church members did not register an objection to a Negro family moving into their neighborhood.¹ This compares with 48.2 per cent of those respondents in the present study who do not register actual disapproval.

In summary, since there has been little research on attitudes of church members toward Negro residential proximity, it is difficult to determine whether their apparent higher intolerance than the national averages for the North and West is due to their status as church members, or as urban residents, or to some other unknown factor or factors. Nevertheless, the findings do not lend support to the hypothesis that the majority of respondents would not disapprove of a Negro family of similar education and income moving into their neighborhood.

Table 6 also shows the respondents' attitudes regarding Negroes' of similar education and income moving next door. It is noted that the total proportion registering disapproval is almost the same (52.3 per cent) as the proportion who disapproved of Negroes' moving into the neighborhood (51.9 per cent). However, the proportion of those who strongly disapprove is higher with respect to moving next door (38 per cent) than moving into the neigh-

¹Friedrichs, "Christians and Residential Exclusion," op. cit., pp. 18-20.

borhood (30.8 per cent). A nationwide study of whites in the North and South found 52 per cent willing to live in the same neighborhood with Negroes and 41 per cent willing to live next door.¹

Table 6 also points up the difference between how the respondents view the possibility of Negro immigration and how they perceive their neighbors' viewing it. Whereas slightly over 9 per cent of the respondents indicated they would strongly approve of a Negro family both moving next door and into the neighborhood, not a single respondent thought his neighbors would strongly approve of either. The respondents had a total of 30.5 per cent registering either mild or strong approval of a Negro family moving into the neighborhood. However, the proportion of their neighbors they felt would be in these same two categories was a mere 1.5 per cent. Whereas 51.9 per cent of the respondents expressed disapproval of Negroes' moving into their neighborhood, they estimated that 86.4 per cent of their neighbors would disapprove.

The writer knows of no research on this. However, from a consideration of the findings of the studies cited earlier, including both nationwide and community-type surveys, it is doubtful that the assessment the respondents

¹New York University, op. cit., p. 10.

make of their neighbors' attitudes is correct.¹ Intolerance of Negro residential proximity in this high a proportion has not been found by studies since prior to World War II. Moreover, the 1956 study by Ben Gaffin & Associates found that even in the South the proportion of those unwilling to reside in a neighborhood with Negroes was no higher than 68 per cent.²

Why do the respondents in this study feel, apparently erroneously, that such a high proportion of their neighbors would disapprove? It is possible that, consciously or unconsciously, they need to feel less intolerant than others because of the "American Creed,"³ with its values of equality and brotherhood. It is possible that the individual's own intolerant attitudes gain some support, and even justification, if he can feel that his neighbors (perhaps one of his important reference groups) are even less tolerant than he.

Table 7 shows the respondents' attitudes on four other questions pertinent to tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The first, third, and fourth questions on this table, along with the second and fourth on Table 6, constitute the five questions from which the tolerance score is derived.

¹Ibid., pp. 4-19.

²Ibid., p. 16.

³Myrdal, op. cit., I, xlv.

TABLE 7
ATTITUDES TOWARD RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION OF THE NEGRO

Statement ^a	Strongly Agree		Mildly Agree		Would Be Undecided		Mildly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Number	Per-centage ^b	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage
It would be unfair for anyone in my neighborhood to sell or rent a house to Negroes, of similar education and income.....	104	39.1	45	16.9	22	8.3	53	19.9	40	15.0
A Negro family of similar education and income wouldn't be as happy living in my neighborhood as it would be living in a predominantly Negro neighborhood.....	126	47.4	47	17.7	49	18.4	25	9.4	16	6.0

^aRespondent was asked to place a check, after each statement, in the column that best expressed his reaction.

^bPercentages do not total 100 per cent because of a few respondents who did not answer all the questions.

TABLE 7 --Continued

Statement	Strongly Agree		Mildly Agree		Would Be Undecided		Mildly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage
If a Negro family of similar education and income moved into my neighborhood I would begin looking for a new home elsewhere.....	60	22.6	24	9.1	65	24.4	32	12.0	85	32.0
It is best for Negroes, no matter what their level of income and education, to live by themselves in one section of the community..	98	36.8	28	10.5	37	13.9	38	14.3	65	24.4

It is observed that 56 per cent of the respondents either mildly or strongly agree that it would be unfair for anyone in their neighborhood to sell or rent to Negroes of similar education and income. In Friedrich's study of 112 suburban New Jersey respondents (including 9 non-church members) the proportion answering the same to a similar question was 68 per cent.¹ "Fairness" here is presumably interpreted by the respondents to mean fairness to their neighbors (again, perhaps an important reference group for them) rather than fairness to Negroes. The creed of the neighborhood would here seem take precedence over the "American Creed."

Table 7 also shows that 65.1 per cent of the respondents feel a Negro family of similar education and income would not be as happy living in their neighborhood as in a predominantly Negro neighborhood. Only 15 per cent feel they would be as happy. This response probably measures tolerance to some extent. However, it appears to the writer that it is not a completely trustworthy measurement. For example, one respondent who obtained a tolerance score in the highest division on the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant), wrote in this comment on the questionnaire: "Most of my neighbors would see to it they were unhappy." Another wrote of observing a Negro family look at a home for sale

¹Friedrichs, "Christians and Residential Exclusion," op.cit., p. 21.

in her neighborhood and then hearing a neighbor shout to them: "Go back to your own side of the tracks!" Only 28.6 per cent of those respondents in the highest division on the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant) feel a Negro family would be as happy living in their neighborhood. Friedrichs found a similar proportion in his study who felt a Negro family would be unhappier living in the respondent's neighborhood (68 per cent).¹

Table 7 shows that a total of 31.7 per cent of the respondents agree that they would begin looking for a new home elsewhere if a Negro family of similar education and income moved into their neighborhood. This is the lowest proportion of respondents falling into the two most intolerant categories in any of the five questions from which the tolerance score is derived. It is recalled that the proportion disapproving of Negroes' moving into their neighborhood is 51.9 per cent. The findings here are consistent with the few other studies which bear on this aspect of the subject. A considerably lower proportion of people usually say they would take any action, including moving away, than say they would object to Negroes' presence.² However, researchers at the New York University Research Center for

¹Ibid., p. 21.

²New York University, op. cit., pp. 19-23.

Human Relations have concluded that peoples' actual behavior when faced with residential integration is likely to be less tolerant than they indicate in attitude surveys. For example, more people seem to move when Negroes enter their neighborhoods than the surveys indicate would be the case.¹

In this latter connection, the minister of one of the churches in the present study which is located in an integrated neighborhood indicated to the writer that there are a number of persons in that church who say they would not object to one or a few Negro families moving in. However, they express alarm when a large number begin to arrive. This same sentiment was expressed by four of the respondents in written comments on the questionnaire. The concept of the "tip point" is relevant here.² The proportion of Negroes a white neighborhood will absorb without a mass exodus of white residents occurring seems to vary from situation to situation.³

Table 7 also indicates that a minority of the respondents feel that it is not best for Negroes to live by themselves in one section of the community. This figure is 38.7 per cent.

¹Ibid., p. 54.

²Supra, p. 63.

³Rapkin, op. cit., pp. 55-67.

The findings discussed in this section on general attitudes toward Negro residential proximity lead the writer to feel there is support here for the hypothesis that the respondents' cultural values transcend their religious values, with respect to this problem. Few of them would deny that Christianity stands opposed to all forms of segregation. Their own denomination is on record in favor of open occupancy housing.¹ The typical respondent, however, seems either to deny or ignore the existence of the tension between Christian ethical norms and the values of secular culture. The recent comment of a sociologist of religion is germane:

Protestantism has become so identified with economic success, respectability, and middle class virtues that large segments of the clergy and laity alike have lost sight of basic spiritual goals.²

Opinions Regarding Consequences of Negro Residential Proximity

Table 8 indicates how likely the respondents feel it is that eight different situations would arise as a result of Negroes, of similar education and income, moving into their neighborhoods.

It is noted that only 11 per cent feel it is unlikely that many of their neighbors would move away.

¹Doctrines and Discipline . . ., op. cit., p. 707.

²Lensky, op. cit., pp. 317-18.

TABLE 8
OPINIONS REGARDING CONSEQUENCES OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Situation ^a	Answer					
	Likely		50-50 Chance		Unlikely	
	Number	Per- centage ^b	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage
Many of my neighbors would move away.....	145	54.5	89	33.5	29	10.9
It would provide a better setting to teach children American ideals.....	91	34.2	79	29.7	88	33.1
Property values would be lowered.....	175	65.8	58	21.8	30	11.3
It would be an opportunity to make new friends.....	71	26.7	73	27.4	116	43.6
The social standing of the neighborhood would be lowered.....	135	50.8	72	27.1	53	19.9
It would lead to intermarriage.....	35	13.2	53	19.9	172	64.7
Crime and delinquency would increase.....	37	13.9	52	19.5	175	65.8
There would be more disease.....	22	8.3	32	12.0	209	78.6

^aThe question asked if it is likely the situation would arise from Negroes, of similar education and income to neighbors', moving into neighborhood.

^bThe totals of the percentages are not 100.0 per cent because of those who did not answer the question.

Feeling there is a 50-50 chance of such action are 34 per cent, and 54 per cent feel it is likely. This item was placed in the questionnaire partly to test what has been termed "fear of loss of neighborhood associations." Abrams lists this as one of the chief fears of the average homeowner who is faced with the prospect of minority group immigration. The findings in the present study would seem to lend support to his hypothesis.¹

The second question in Table 8 shows the most nearly even distribution of responses of any of the eight on the table. The fact that a total of 63.9 per cent think it is either likely or a 50-50 chance that a better setting would arise in which to teach American ideals may be evidence of the influence of the "American Creed."² Although less than one third of the respondents (30.5 per cent) register any degree of approval of Negroes moving into their neighborhood, almost two thirds (63.9) believe there would be at least a 50-50 chance such a situation would provide a better setting in which to teach American ideals. There is here, perhaps, some indication of the "American Dilemma." This is Myrdal's phrase and he defines it thus:

The "American Dilemma" . . . is the ever-raging conflict between, on the one hand, the valuations preserved on the general plane which we shall call the

¹Abrams, op. cit., p. 262.

²Myrdal, op. cit., I, xlv.

"American Creed," where the American thinks, talks, and acts under the influence of high national and Christian precepts, and, on the other hand, the valuations on specific planes of individual and group living, where personal and local interests; economic, social, and sexual jealousies; consideration of community prestige and conformity; group prejudice against particular persons or types of people; and all sorts of miscellaneous wants, impulses, and habits dominate his outlook.¹

Table 8 also shows the overwhelming consensus of the respondents that property values would be adversely affected by Negro immigration. Holding that it is likely property values would be lowered are 65.8 per cent. Another 21.8 per cent think there is a 50-50 chance this would occur. Only 11.3 per cent say it is unlikely. Ten of the respondents wrote in comments concerning their views that property values would decline. A typical response: "I am sure our property values would go down, and when money is concerned--large sums--you can hardly blame people for objecting."

Writers in the field of race and housing have long noted the widespread view among the general public and the real estate profession that Negro occupancy depresses property values.² Merton has termed the pattern which has often resulted from Negro immigration "the self-fulfilling prophecy."³ Property owners believe this will lower values

¹Ibid., I, xliii.

²Ibid., I, 623; McEntire, op. cit., pp. 158-64; Weaver, op. cit., pp. 279-303; Abrams, op. cit., p. 285.

³Merton, op. cit., pp. 179-95.

and immediately take flight. This gluts the market and prices are thereby depressed. Although their premise may have been incorrect, their actions have the effect of making their original premise or prophecy come true. Abrams lists fear of loss of investment as one of the three chief fears of property owners who are confronted with minority group immigration.¹

Until Laurenti's study appeared under the auspices of the Commission on Race and Housing in 1960, there had not been a comprehensive study of the problem. He made a study of close to 10,000 home sales in San Francisco, Philadelphia, and Oakland, California. He also undertook an extensive survey of prior studies in the field. He writes:

The major statistical finding of the present study is that during the time period and for the cases studied the entry of nonwhites into previously all-white neighborhoods was more often associated with price improvement or stabilization than with price weakening.²

In his carefully designed study he found that in 41 per cent of the cases there was no significant difference in price behavior between areas into which there had been nonwhite entry and the control areas where there had been no nonwhite entry. In 44 per cent of the cases prices in the areas of nonwhite entry rose from 5 to 26 per cent over

¹Abrams, op. cit., p. 262.

²Luigi Laurenti, Property Values and Race (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), p. 47.

prices in the control areas. In the remaining 15 per cent of the cases prices fell between 5 and 9 per cent lower in areas of nonwhite entry than in the control areas where there had been no nonwhite entry. Thus, in 85 per cent of the cases prices remained stable or rose after nonwhite entry into previously all-white neighborhoods.¹

Laurenti's data covered the period 1943-1955. He reviewed other studies, including those covering the periods 1920-1930 and 1940-1951 in Chicago; 1949-1953 in Kansas City; 1940-1950 and 1946-1950 in Detroit; and 1944-1954 in Portland, Oregon. All of these studies found nonwhite entry to be more often associated with rising rather than falling prices. However, in some of these studies it was not clear if prices in nonwhite entry areas rose as rapidly as in other areas.²

Friedrich's findings are roughly comparable to those of the present study with respect to beliefs about property values. In his study 79 per cent of the respondents agreed that property values would go down if Negroes moved into their neighborhood.³ Rapkin and Grigsby note a 1959 study in Newark, New Jersey, wherein 75 per cent of the white respondents said property values would decline with Negro immigration. Eleven per cent said there would

¹Ibid., pp. 51-52.

²Ibid., pp. 52-53.

³Friedrichs, "Christians and Residential Exclusion," op. cit., p. 21.

be no change and 2 per cent forecast a rise.¹ This same study indicates that Negroes are probably influenced to some degree by popular opinion on the subject. Of their number, 33 per cent felt property values would fall, 35 per cent believed there would be no change, and 11 per cent predicted a rise.²

It is not clear to what extent the popularly expressed belief that Negroes depress property values is responsible for white objection to integrated neighborhoods. Friedrichs found that renters objected as strongly to residential integration as did home owners.³ However, in the present study renters appear to be more accepting of such integration than do homeowners. Nevertheless, it would appear that those in the Methodist Church who are interested in seeing racial residential segregation reduced have a clear-cut educational task with respect to church members' erroneous beliefs about property values and race. Doubtless the effectiveness of any such educational effort will hinge in large part on the extent to which beliefs about the matter serve as support for attitudes that have a deeper root. Those persons who, for various psychosocial reasons, need to feel superior to Negroes will not be overly influenced by such an educational approach.

¹Rapkin, op. cit., p. 91.

²Ibid.

³Friedrichs, "Christians and Residential Exclusion," op. cit., p. 21.

Table 8 further indicates the proportion of respondents who see racial residential integration as an opportunity to make new friends. Those believing this to be unlikely constitute 43.6 per cent of the total, those saying there would be a 50-50 chance of this occurring are 27.4 per cent, and those seeing it as likely are 26.7 per cent of the total. The writer feels that the low proportion answering "likely" on this question reflects a feeling of considerable social distance from Negroes on the part of the respondents. Allport has noted that measurements of social distance throughout the nation consistently find Negroes as the least favored group. All other groups are more acceptable as neighbors, social equals, and as kinsmen.¹

Table 8 further indicates that only 19 per cent of the respondents believe it unlikely the social standing of the neighborhood would not be lowered by the advent of Negroes. Feeling it is likely such would be the case are 50.8 per cent, and 27.1 per cent feel there would be a 50-50 chance. This seems to reflect a fear of loss of social status. Abrams lists this as the third principal fear white homeowners experience when minority group members begin to move in.² One of the respondents in the present

¹Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, op. cit., pp. 38-39.

²Abrams, op. cit., p. 262.

study wrote that Negroes "could not rise to our level."

In our society the neighborhood in which one resides is a prime indicator of one's social status. The areas in which nonwhites live are generally considered to be near the bottom of the social prestige scale. Hence, white residents normally view the entrance of nonwhites as a distinct threat to their social status.¹ It is conceivable that some relatively unprejudiced persons might be strongly intolerant of Negro residential proximity because of their concern with their own social status. In their study of privately developed interracial housing, the Griers quote a Federal Housing Administration director in a West Coast city as saying that the biggest obstacle to interracial housing "is that the average white worries about what his friends will say."²

In a study of a Detroit residential neighborhood undergoing racial integration, Mayer found that even the "intellectuals" were likely to move from the community when their status was threatened. They were slower to move out than other whites, but when the influx of large numbers of Negro children threatened to lower educational standards in the schools, the intellectuals, too, tended to

¹McEntire, op. cit., pp. 86-87.

²Eunice and George Grier, Privately Developed Interracial Housing (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), p. 246.

leave. Mayer saw this action as being the result of the fact that education is so important to this group and that it is the main source of their social status.¹

It is interesting that some of the views that are often associated with prejudice gain a minimum of support from the respondents in this study. The three final questions on Table 8 point this up. Those who feel it is likely that Negro movement into their neighborhoods would lead to intermarriage are only 13.2 per cent. Those who feel it is likely this would lead to an increase in crime and delinquency are but 13.9 per cent. Those who believe there would be more disease are a low 8.3 per cent. Those who feel there would be a 50-50 chance of such occurrences are relatively low in proportion also. The percentage is below 20 per cent in each case. More than three fourths (78.6) per cent) believe it unlikely that there would be more disease. Almost two thirds (65.8 per cent) feel it is unlikely there would be an increase in crime and delinquency. A similar proportion (64.7) say it is unlikely intermarriage would result.

These latter findings suggest to the writer that the present respondents might achieve a considerably higher "tolerance score" on a scale designed to determine a gener-

¹Nathan Glazer and Davis McEntire, (eds.), Studies in Housing and Minority Groups (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), p. 212.

al tolerance in attitudes toward Negroes. It is likely that testing for tolerance of Negro residential proximity is productive of more intolerant responses than almost any other phase of Negro-white relations.

Social Significance Attached to Residential
Segregation of the Negro

The present study attempts to assess the degree of social significance the respondents attach to the phenomenon of residential segregation of the Negro. Modern students of race relations from Myrdal¹ to Simpson and Yinger² have noted the crucial significance of residential segregation. The majority of the respondents in the present study have a different view.

Table 9 shows that only 19.9 per cent of the respondents consider residential segregation of the Negro to be a serious problem. Those who feel it is a mild social problem constitute 21.8 per cent of the total. Stating categorically that this is not a social problem are 48.9 per cent, and 8.6 per cent are undecided.

As a further measure of the significance attached to this phenomenon, the respondents were asked to rank in importance five problems facing Southern California communities. Table 10 shows these findings. On a scale where

¹Myrdal, op. cit., I, 618.

²Simpson, op. cit., p. 499.

TABLE 9
SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE ATTACHED TO PROBLEM OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION OF NEGROES
BY TOLERANCE SCALE DIVISIONS

Significance ^a	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Totals	
	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage
Not a social problem	18	13.8	13	10.0	23	17.7	76	58.3	130	48.9
Mild social problem	21	36.2	13	22.4	14	24.1	10	17.2	58	21.8
Serious social problem	23	43.4	17	32.1	8	15.1	5	9.4	53	19.9
Undecided	8	34.8	7	30.4	3	13.0	5	21.7	23	8.6
Total	70	50	48	96	264	99.2 ^b

^aThe question asked: "Do you think the fact that most Negroes live by themselves in separate sections of our communities is a social problem?"

^bTwo respondents (0.8 per cent) did not answer the question.

TABLE 10
SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE ATTACHED TO COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

Problem ^a	Mean Rank ^b
Air pollution (smog).....	1.51
Use of beverage alcohol.....	2.74
Negroes' being concentrated in separate housing areas.....	3.76
Littering of highways and recreation areas.....	4.27
Traffic congestion.....	2.68

^aThe problems are listed in the order in which they appeared in the questionnaire.

^bRespondents were asked to list the problems in order of importance, 1 to 5.

1 represents the most important and 5 the least important, air pollution (smog) is clearly considered the most important problem. Its mean rank is 1.51. Traffic congestion, second (2.68), and use of beverage alcohol, third (2.74), are considered almost equal in importance. The concentration of Negroes in separate housing areas is ranked well down the list in fourth position with a 3.76 score. Only littering (4.27) is ranked below racial residential segregation in importance.

Table 9 also shows the relationship between the social significance attached to the problem and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. As might be expected, apparently those who feel residential segregation of the Negro is a serious problem are those who are most tolerant of Negro residential proximity. Conversely, the more intolerant group tends to discount the seriousness of the problem. Of the 19.9 per cent who say this is a serious problem, 75.5 per cent fall in the two highest divisions of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant and Mildly Intolerant), whereas, only 24.5 per cent are in the two lowest divisions (Intolerant and Very Intolerant). On the other hand, of those who consider residential segregation of the Negro not to be a serious social problem, only 23.8 per cent are in the two highest divisions of the Tolerance Scale, as compared with the 76 per cent who are in the two lowest divisions.

The writer feels that these findings give some support to the hypothesis that leaders in national and community life, the communication media, the Methodist denomination, and local Methodist churches have not done enough to make Methodists aware of the crucial nature of the problem of racial residential segregation of the Negro; and that the respondents will not perceive it as a serious social problem.

There are a number of other probable reasons for this situation. The lack of close contact and communication with Negroes is one. Perhaps the inclination to deny the problem exists is another. To the extent whites feel guilt over this situation, the psychological mechanism of denial can be utilized to relieve the tension created by that guilt. The writer interprets these findings as reflecting an appalling admixture of social ignorance, moral apathy, and spiritual insensitivity.

Opinions Regarding the Local Church's Role

One section of the questionnaire was designed with the purpose of attempting to ascertain something of what the respondents feel the role of their local church should be in regard to racial residential segregation. They were asked to give "Yes" and "No" answers to a series of possible courses of action which followed the question: "Should your own church use the following approaches in

regard to those Negroes who want to be able to live wherever they can afford to?"

Table 11 gives the findings of this section. Only 9.8 per cent state they would not be in favor of welcoming Negroes moving into the neighborhood into membership in the church. Saying they would favor such action are 82 per cent, and 8.3 per cent did not respond to the question (interestingly, this section of the questionnaire produced more "no responses" than any other). It will be remembered that of the total number of respondents from the 9 churches in segregated neighborhoods only 26.3 per cent fall into the highest division on the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant). Another 19.5 per cent are in the second highest division (Mildly Intolerant), and 54.1 per cent fall in the two lowest divisions (Intolerant and Very Intolerant).¹ Yet, 82 per cent are willing to see their church receive Negroes into membership. It will also be recalled that on the single question relating to their feelings about Negroes moving into their neighborhoods only 30.5 per cent expressed any degree of approval.²

In seeking an explanation for these findings the writer has come to feel that at least three factors are operating. First, this willingness to accept Negroes into

¹Supra, pp. 106-107.

²Supra, p. 110.

TABLE 11
OPINIONS ON THE ROLE OF THE CHURCH REGARDING RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION OF NEGROES

Approaches ^a	Answer					
	Yes		No		No Response	
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage
Welcome any Negro families moving into the neighborhood into membership in the church.....	218	82.0	26	9.8	22	8.3
Picket a new housing tract that will not sell to Negroes.....	15	5.6	221	83.1	30	11.3
Pass a resolution opposing the entrance of Negroes into a white neighborhoods.....	19	7.1	216	81.2	31	11.7
Cooperate with any groups who want to keep Negroes out of white neighborhoods.....	31	11.7	201	75.6	34	12.8
Pass a resolution favoring "Fair Housing" legislation.....	113	42.5	102	38.3	51	19.2
Preach and teach brotherhood.....	231	86.8	5	1.9	30	11.3

^aThe question was: "Should your own church use the following approaches in regard to those Negroes who want to be able to live wherever they can afford to?"

one's church but not into one's neighborhood smacks of compartmentalization. Such a willingness permits the respondent to impute equality to the Negro in one specific and limited area while still avoiding the necessity of applying the concept of equality to the whole personality of the Negro. Tillman holds that such compartmentalization:

. . . may reinforce among majority group members the resistance to open neighborhoods; for, in this instance, it permits the majority person to embrace some degree of rational thinking about minority persons while preserving the one symbol--inequality of housing opportunity--which makes it unnecessary for him to impute equality to the whole personality of the minority group member.¹

The writer also feels it is possible that local churches have placed a disproportionate emphasis on achieving racially inclusive churches. That is, due to the fact of the churches' largely segregated status and the resulting guilt and embarrassment, perhaps local churches have tended to talk too much about getting their own houses in order to the neglect of conditions in the community which make it next to impossible for them to do so. A church in an overwhelmingly white neighborhood and white community, as most of the churches in this study are, might better emphasize the need to achieve a racially inclusive neighborhood and community. Only then will a racially inclusive church (if it is to be more than token inclusion) become a viable option.

¹Tillman, op. cit., p. 12.

It may be the case, too, that a number of the respondents are giving the "church" answer on this question. The questionnaire did come from a source most of them would identify, at least indirectly, with their denomination. Moreover, it came to them because they were church members. If at any point in the questionnaire there would be a tendency to give the answers they felt they should give, it might well be here.

Stotts and Deats have remarked on the willingness of Methodists to oppose segregation in the church to a greater extent than in the community at large.¹ Statistical results of a nationwide sample of Methodists published in 1962 show that 18.6 per cent say that all racial discrimination and enforced segregation should be abolished. Those who say racial segregation should be abolished at all levels in the church, however, number 32.7 per cent (this sample includes the South).²

Table 11 also shows how the respondents would feel about having their local church picket a new housing tract which will not sell to Negroes. The results are not startling. Favoring such action are only 5.6 per cent. Opposed to picketing are 83.1 per cent, and 11.3 per cent did not

¹Herbert E. Stotts and Paul Deats, Jr., Methodism and Society: Guidelines for Strategy (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, p. 96.

answer the question. These findings lend some support to the hypothesis that the overwhelming majority of Methodists do not view aggressive social action as a legitimate function of their local church. Of course, a larger proportion might favor some strong social action on an issue they were more concerned about. However, it will be remembered that almost 20 per cent of the respondents consider residential segregation of the Negro a serious social problem, whereas, only 5.6 per cent would favor aggressive social action on the issue in the form of picketing.

Table 11 does make it clear, however, that the respondents are strongly opposed to their churches' taking any action to combat racial integration of their neighborhoods. Only 7.1 per cent favor their churches' passing a resolution opposing the entrance of Negroes into a white neighborhood. Only 11.7 per cent want their church to cooperate with any groups wishing to keep Negroes out.

At the same time, Table 11 also shows that a substantial number would favor their churches' passing a resolution favoring "Fair Housing" legislation (legislation guaranteeing minority groups equal access to housing). In favor of such a resolution are 42.5 per cent, as compared with 38.3 per cent who are opposed. Significantly, 19.2 per cent fail to answer this question. This latter figure may include a number of respondents who are uncertain about the meaning of the term "Fair Housing." However, in view

of the widespread discussion of the issue in the mass communication media in Southern California, the writer feels it is more likely that it reflects indecision on the part of the respondents.

As would be expected, a large proportion of those in the highest division of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant) favor their churches' passing resolutions on the subject (72.9 per cent). Also, as would be expected, a small proportion of those in the lowest division (Very Intolerant) favor such a resolution (12.5 per cent). However, it is instructive to note that of those in the second lowest division of the Tolerance Scale (Intolerant), 47.9 per cent favor such a resolution (these percentages are not shown on the table).

The question arises as to why such a sizeable proportion of those who are intolerant of Negro residential proximity would favor a resolution supporting "Fair Housing" legislation. The writer would advance as a partial explanation at this point the suggestion that a number of those who oppose racial residential integration would not do so if they felt they could escape the social disapproval of their reference groups. Hence, if strict legislation prevented housing discrimination, they could refrain from discrimination themselves without feeling disloyal to their neighbors and their community. Moreover, a number of the respondents may feel that such legislation would reduce

the possibility of property values declining. One respondent, an accountant, who fell in the "Intolerant" division of the Tolerance Scale wrote:

My adverse feelings about Negroes moving into my neighborhood are almost completely based on my desire, or need, to protect myself economically. Under present social prejudices I know that I would suffer economically if a Negro family moved into my neighborhood. I support any legislation that would nudge the population, as a whole, into fair housing and complete race integration. In fact, it would not be a bad idea if the government subsidized Negro families in a mass movement to move into all intimate neighborhoods all at once. This would curtail the possibility of the present members of all white communities relocating since there wouldn't be any place else to go. Therefore, an economic status quo would exist.

The finding that a total of 42.5 per cent of the respondents actually favor their churches passing "Fair Housing" resolutions, while a lesser proportion (38.3 per cent) oppose it, suggests to the writer that church members may be more open to this type of social action than much of the laity and ministry suspect. It is certain that no large proportion of local churches has gone on record in favor of such legislation. In the absence of any study of the subject, the writer would venture that the number of local churches which have gone on record on such controversial issues is extremely small. It is also interesting that the percentage of those favoring such a resolution (42.5) is close to the proportion of Methodists reporting in a nation-wide study that they feel social change is of

"equal or greater importance than individual conversion."¹ That figure was 46 per cent. In Lensky's Detroit study of church members he found that 42 per cent of them felt the clergy should take a stand on racial integration.²

The results of the final question on Table 11 are not surprising. The overwhelming majority of respondents (86.8 per cent) favor their churches preaching and teaching brotherhood. Only 1.9 per cent advocate the contrary, and 11.3 per cent do not respond. It is worthy of note here that 95.8 per cent of those in the next to lowest division on the Tolerance Scale (Intolerant) favor their churches teaching and preaching brotherhood. Even 71.9 per cent of those in the lowest division (Very Intolerant) favor it (these figures are not on the table).

Doubtless, a variety of factors are at work here. If one is to be a member of the Methodist Church it is expected that he is to believe in "brotherhood." But this conceptual frame is filled out with a different content by different persons. One respondent in this study, a surgeon, who fell in the "Very Intolerant" division on the Tolerance Scale wrote:

The church should teach the brotherhood of man in its meaning, and not the modernistic social meaning. While we have a social religion if we are Christians, brotherhood is a spiritual quality that the true Christian

¹Stotts, op. cit., p. 44.

²Lensky, op. cit., p. 284.

must try to achieve and not a temporal meaning or quality.

Another respondent, a dentist, favored the church preaching and teaching brotherhood--"if interpretation." He also scored in the "Very Intolerant" division of the Tolerance Scale.

The writer conjectures that one reason for the endorsement of "brotherhood" by such a high proportion of those who are intolerant of Negro residential proximity is that the local church often lacks the quality of "specificity" in its approach to this doctrine. Brotherhood may mean contributing to the support of Negro colleges or even agreeing to open church membership to all races, but how often and with what depth is brotherhood's meaning for such issues as residential segregation discussed? Another important reason, the writer suggests, is that though most of the respondents believe in brotherhood, they believe even more strongly in their neighborhood code. This normally calls for a homogeneous, closed residential area.

Good Acquaintance or Friendship with Negroes
and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity

Good acquaintance or friendship with Negroes is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. Those respondents who indicate such a relationship appear to be far more tolerant than those who do not. The chi square test shows the dif-

ference between these two groups to be significant at below the one tenth of 1 per cent level. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association finds an association between this kind of contact and tolerance of Negro residential proximity of .35. This is the highest degree of association found for any of the variables in the study.

Table 12 shows the relationship between this variable and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. It is observed that 69.9 per cent of those who have Negro friends or acquaintances are in the two highest divisions of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant and Mildly Intolerant). Only 27.8 per cent of those who do not have Negro friends or acquaintances are in the two highest divisions. Almost half (48.3 per cent) of those who do not have Negro friends or acquaintances fall in the lowest division of the Tolerance Scale (Very Intolerant), as compared with 18.4 per cent of those who do have such relationships.

Table 13 shows the relationship between those persons who report having actually entertained a Negro in their homes within the past two years and their attitudes toward Negro residential proximity. It was theorized that this would be a measure of a stronger degree of friendship than discussed just above. This variable also proved to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The difference between those who had entertained Negroes in their homes within the past two

TABLE 12

ACQUAINTANCE OR FRIENDSHIP WITH NEGROES AND TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Acquaintance or Friendship	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Totals	
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage
Do have good acquaintances or friends who are Negroes.....	48	46.6	24	23.3	12	11.6	19	18.4	103	38.7
Do not have good acquaintances or friends who are Negroes.....	16	10.6	26	17.2	36	23.8	73	48.3	151	56.8
Total.....	64	50	48	92	254	95.5 ^a

$$\chi^2 = 52.44; \text{ d.f. } = 3; p = < .001$$

^aTwelve respondents (4.5 per cent) did not answer the question on acquaintance or friendship.

TABLE 13

CLOSE SOCIAL CONTACTS AND TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Close Social Contacts ^a	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant ^b		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Totals	
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage
Did entertain a Negro in home	17	68.0	3	12.0	3	12.0	2	8.0	25	9.4
Did not entertain a Negro in home	48	21.1	47	20.7	42	18.5	90	39.6	227	85.3
Total	65	50	45	92	252	94.7 ^c

$$\chi^2 = 17.00; \text{d.f.} = 2; p = < .001$$

^aThe question read: "I have entertained a Negro socially in my home within the last two years (Yes or No)."

^bFor purposes of the chi square test the "mildly intolerant" and "intolerant" categories were combined.

^cFourteen respondents (5.3 per cent) did not answer the question on close social contacts.

years and those who had not is found to be significant at below the one tenth of 1 per cent level by the chi square test. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association finds an association between these two variables of .22. It is noted that this association figure is lower than that for acquaintance-friendship. However, the number of respondents in the "entertained" group is only 25. The test is not as reliable with this small number.

Table 13 shows that 68 per cent of this group who have entertained Negroes in their homes within the past two years are in the highest division of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant), as compared with only 21.1 per cent of the very large number of respondents who had not entertained Negroes in their homes within the past two years.

Much research has been carried out on the effects of contacts between members of white and Negro groups. Simpson and Yinger comment that the influence that has received the most careful research attention in recent years is "the degree of status equality or status difference among the participants in intergroup relations."¹ They cite studies conducted among adolescents, college students, and military personnel which tend to indicate that contacts with persons of different races who are of similar or equal status are conducive to tolerant attitudes toward

¹Simpson, op. cit., p. 751.

that group.¹

In their study of interracial low-rent public housing projects, Deutsch and Collins found that when there was a higher degree of contact between Negroes and whites, the whites' attitudes toward Negroes were correspondingly higher in degree of favorability. They reported that the effect of such contact was strong enough to "reverse relationships often encountered in research studies between prejudiced attitudes and such factors as education, religion, and political attitudes."² Wilner, Walkley, and Cook reported somewhat similar findings in a study of similar design. They concluded that the more intimate the contact between whites and Negroes, the more favorable the attitudes. However, they also note that these attitudes are most favorable when the perceived social climate surrounding interracial contact is highly favorable.³

Allport notes that true acquaintance has been shown to lessen prejudice by most studies.⁴ He concludes:

Prejudice (unless deeply rooted in the character structure of the individual) may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the common pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional

¹Ibid., pp. 751-53.

²Deutsch, op. cit., 122-23.

³Wilner, op. cit., p. 149.

⁴Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, op. cit., pp. 264-81.

supports (i.e., by law, custom or local atmosphere), and provided it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups.¹

The writer is assuming here that much of the contact which takes place among the respondents who reported having good acquaintances or friends who are Negroes is contact of an equal status nature. It should be remembered that studies of this nature cannot lay claim to showing a cause and effect relationship. What is evident here is a marked degree of association between contact of this nature and tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

It is somewhat surprising to find a relatively high proportion of the respondents (38.7 per cent) reporting good acquaintance or friendship with Negroes. The fact that only 9.4 per cent report having entertained a Negro socially in their home within the past two years does make one wonder about the depth of many of these relationships, however. The writer states that the 38.7 per cent figure seems rather high because only 4.9 per cent of the total report living in the same neighborhood with Negroes, and less than half of those saying they have Negro acquaintances or friends report working closely with them on the job. However, it is probable that working with Negroes is a major source of acquaintance and friendship, in that 45.6 per cent of those who indicate they have Negro acquaintan-

¹Ibid., p. 281.

ces also report working closely with them (or that the head of their household does so). Moreover, it is possible that a number of others met Negroes whom they classify as good acquaintances or friends at their place of employment, even though they do not "work closely" with them (the questionnaire specified this latter condition).

Many students of race relations feel there is a critical dearth of meaningful contact or communication between the two races. Lensky has remarked that in close relationships, such as friendship, there is a tendency for segregation to be the pattern in the urban North as much as in the rural South.¹ James Baldwin has written of the northerner:

He never sees Negroes. Southerners see them all the time. Northerners never think about them whereas Southerners are never really thinking of anything else. Negroes are, therefore, ignored in the North and are under surveillance in the South, and suffer hideously in both places.²

Myrdal observed that the northerner seems to find it convenient for his good conscience to forget about the Negro, and indicated that segregating the Negro residentially is a cause as well as an effect of social distance.³

The degree of association found in this study between acquaintance or friendship with Negroes and toler-

¹Lensky, op. cit., p. 36.

²Baldwin, op. cit., p. 70.

³Myrdal, op. cit., I, 600-601.

ance of Negro residential proximity lends some support to the hypothesis that equal status contact with Negroes is directly related to tolerant attitudes toward Negroes and to tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

Employment with Negroes and Tolerance of
Negro Residential Proximity

Working closely with Negroes on the job (or the head of the respondent's household doing so) is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. Those who do have such a contact with Negroes appear to be more tolerant than those who do not. The chi square test indicates that the difference between these two groups is significant at the 1 per cent level. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association finds an association between this variable and tolerance of Negro residential proximity of .18.

Table 14 shows the relationship between this variable and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. It can be seen that 56.6 per cent of those who work closely with Negroes are in the two highest divisions of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant and Mildly Intolerant), as compared with 38.6 per cent of those who do not work closely with Negroes.

The fact that 30.1 per cent of the respondents (or household heads) report working closely with Negroes underscores the probable importance of this means of com-

TABLE 14
EMPLOYMENT WITH NEGROES AND TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Employment with Negroes	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Totals	
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage
Do work closely with Negroes	27	33.8	18	22.5	15	18.8	20	25.0	80	30.1
Do not work closely with Negroes	35	21.1	29	17.5	29	17.5	73	44.0	166	62.4
Total	62	47	44	93	246	92.5 ^a

$$\chi^2 = 13.52; \text{d.f.} = 3; p = < .01$$

^aTwenty respondents (7.5 per cent) did not answer the question on employment with Negroes.

munication between the races. It is one of the few such avenues available to suburban residents. It is perhaps not too much to say that the economic order is ahead of many other institutions of society in affording opportunities for contact and communication between Negroes and whites.

Much of the discussion in the preceding section (Good Acquaintance or Friendship with Negroes and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity) is relevant here also. Allport holds that tolerance is increased when whites have occupational contacts with Negroes of equal status, or with Negroes of higher occupational status. However, occupational contacts with Negroes who hold only menial positions can be a factor in producing or increasing intolerance.¹

Home Ownership and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity

The home ownership factor is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. Those who own their homes appear to be less tolerant than those who rent their housing. The chi square test shows the difference between these two groups to be significant at the 1 per cent level. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association shows an association between rental of one's own housing and tolerance of Negro residential

¹Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, op. cit., pp. 274-76.

proximity of .18.

Table 15 shows the relationship between home ownership and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. An inspection of the raw data indicated that for the purpose of the chi square test it would be necessary to collapse the house rental and apartment rental categories into one. It is observed that almost twice the proportion of renters as compared with owners are in the highest division of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant). The figures are 41.9 per cent and 21.4 per cent, respectively. At the same time slightly more than twice the proportion of owners as compared with renters are in the lowest division of the Tolerance Scale (Very Intolerant). The figure for the owners is 40.8 per cent and for the renters it is 18.6 per cent.

It was conjectured by the writer that the age factor might be distorting the observed association between home ownership and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. This, because the age 20-29 group was found to be significantly more tolerant than those age 30 and over, and because it was conjectured that this group would exhibit a lower incidence of home ownership. Consequently, a control for age was carried out in the home ownership group. It was found that though the 20-29 age group did have a much lower incidence of home ownership than the 30 and over group, there was still a significant difference in the 30 and over group between the owners and renters. However,

TABLE 15
HOME OWNERSHIP AND TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Housing Ownership or Rental ^a	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Totals	
	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage
Own home.....	45	21.7	42	20.3	36	17.4	84	40.6	207	77.8
Rent house.....	9	50.0	5	27.8	3	16.7	1	5.6	18	6.8
Rent Apartment.....	9	36.0	4	16.0	5	20.0	7	28.0	25	9.4
Total.....	63	51	44	92	250	94.0 ^b

$$\chi^2 = 13.65; \text{d.f.} = 3; p = < .01$$

^aFor purposes of the chi square test the housing ownership and rental categories were collapsed into two divisions: ownership and rental.

^bSixteen respondents (6.0 per cent) indicated "other" living arrangement or did not answer the question.

the measure of degree of association was reduced from .18 to .15 when the age 30 and over group was tested alone. Moreover, the difference was significant at the 5 per cent level for this group rather than at the 1 per cent level which had been obtained for the total group.

There has apparently been little research conducted on the relation of home ownership to tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The two studies the writer uncovered found no relationship. These are Kramer's Chicago study of residential proximity, cited by Wilner, Walkley, and Cook;¹ and Friedrich's study of attitudes toward residential and educational segregation.²

The findings of the present study give some support to one of the hypotheses: Persons who own or are purchasing their homes (and who therefore have a greater economic investment in their housing and are not as mobile as renters) exhibit less willingness to live in neighborhoods where Negroes are moving in than do persons who are renting homes and apartments.

Involvement in Church Program and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity

Involvement in the church program is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residen-

¹Wilner, op. cit., p. 160.

²Friedrichs, "Christians and Residential Exclusion," op. cit., p. 21.

tial proximity. It appears that those who are the more highly involved in the program of their church are the more tolerant. The chi square test, for example, was applied to five separate groups which the writer feels reflect varying degrees or types of involvement in the church program. Table 16 shows the relationship of these involvement variables to tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

The difference between officers of a commission, committee, or organization in their church and those who held no such position was significant at the 1 per cent level. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association shows this officer group has an association with tolerance of Negro residential proximity of .17.

The difference between the group consisting of church school teachers and officers and those who did not hold such positions is significant at the 1 per cent level. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association shows an association between this type of involvement in the church program and tolerance of Negro residential proximity of .16.

The difference between the group composed of members of a commission or committee and those who did not hold such membership is significant at the 2 per cent level. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association shows an association between such membership and tolerance of Negro residential proximity of .15.

TABLE 16

INVOLVEMENT IN THE CHURCH PROGRAM AND TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Position	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Total	Chi Square ^a	V _p
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage			
Church school teacher or officer.....	13	34.2	10	26.3	10	26.3	5	13.2	38	11.44	.01
Others.....	47	22.8	40	19.4	33	16.0	86	41.7	206		
Member of a commission or a committee.....	28	37.8	12	16.2	11	14.9	23	31.1	74	9.87	.02
Others.....	32	18.9	38	22.5	32	18.9	67	39.6	169		
Member of the Official Board.....	13	36.1	8	22.1	6	16.7	9	25.0	36	3.98	n.s. ^b
Others.....	47	22.6	42	20.2	37	17.8	82	39.4	208		

^aIn all chi square computations represented in this table, the degrees of freedom equal three.

^bn.s. = not significant.

TABLE 16 --Continued

Position	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Total	Chi Square	V p =
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage			
Officer of the church.....	5	50.0	0	0	5	50.0	10 ^a	...
Others.....	55	23.5	50	21.4	43	18.4	86	36.8	234		
Officer of a commission, committee or organization.....	16	40.0	8	20.0	5	12.5	11	27.5	40	12.42	.01
Others.....	44	21.6	42	20.6	38	18.6	80	39.2	204		
No position.....	23	18.9	25	20.5	27	22.1	47	38.5	122	6.18	n.s.
Others.....	37	30.3	25	20.5	16	13.1	44	36.1	122		

^aThe small sample size does not allow a chi square computation.

The only involvement group of sufficient size to be tested which did not show a significant association with tolerance of Negro residential proximity was the group made up of members of the Official Board.

Only 10 respondents listed themselves as officers of the church. This number was insufficient for statistical testing.

The group consisting of all respondents indicating they held no position whatever proved to be not significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

Before further analyzing these findings, the writer's rationale for establishing various involvement groups will be explained. Persons in the church school teacher or church school officer group are among those church members who devote the most time to church activities. Most of them carry weekly responsibilities for preparing and teaching church school lessons or administering the church school. Persons who are officers of a commission, committee, or organization in the church normally give as much time to the church as any other group. Most of the key leaders of the church are in this group.¹ From their ranks come the heads of the five major commissions. Also repre-

¹Doctrines and Discipline . . ., op. cit., pp. 56-60, 83-90.

sented in this group are officers of such influential organizations in the life of the local church as the Woman's Society of Christian Service, The Methodist Men's Club, and other adult groups in the church.

Persons who are members of a commission or a committee are not presumed, on the average, to be as highly involved as their officers. However, such membership is presumed to show a higher degree of involvement in the church's program than is the holding of no such position. Membership on the Official Board,¹ the administrative agency of the local church, is also presumed to reflect a higher degree of involvement in the church's program than the average. The "officer of the church" category was placed in the questionnaire to catch any important general officers who might not have placed themselves in one of the other leadership categories. These would include such officers as the church lay leader, the church treasurers, the lay members of the annual conference, and the recording steward.² Only 10 respondents checked this category. An "other position" category was also placed in the questionnaire. The number checking this, 23, was insufficient for statistical testing and represented a wide variety of other positions--such as usher, choir member, and pianist.

An examination of Table 16 indicates that those

¹Ibid., pp. 88-90.

²Ibid., pp. 54-55.

persons who are officers of a commission, committee, or organization in their local church have a high proportion (40 per cent) in the highest division of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant). Sixty per cent of their number are in the two highest divisions. In contrast, only 21.6 per cent of those who hold no such positions are in the highest division and only 42.2 per cent in the two highest divisions.

The group composed of teachers or officers in the church school have 60.5 per cent in the two highest divisions of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant and Mildly Intolerant), but a lower percentage (34.2) than the officers of a commission, committee, or organization in the highest division. Still, it is readily seen that this group of teachers and officers in the church school are more tolerant than those who hold no such positions. The latter group have only 42.2 per cent of their number in the two highest divisions of the Tolerance Scale.

The group which consists of members of a commission or committee have 54 per cent in these same two highest divisions, 37.8 of whom are in the highest division (Tolerant). Again, this group appears to be more tolerant than those who do not hold such membership. The latter have only 18.9 per cent in the highest division and a total of 41.4 per cent in the two highest.

The group comprised of members of the Official Board is found to be not significantly different from all

of those who are not board members. It would appear from a comparison of the two groups on the Tolerance Scale that the members of the Official Board are more tolerant than the latter group. However, the chi square test indicates the difference that exists between the two groups could have occurred by chance between 20 and 30 times in 100 (this constitutes a 30 per cent level of significance, whereas the 5 per cent level is accepted for this study). It is possible that the relatively small number of respondents in the board members group (36) may have influenced the test results. The board members do have 58.2 per cent in the two highest divisions of the Tolerance Scale, as compared with 42.8 per cent of non-board members in these same two divisions.

It is important to note that no significant difference appears between those who hold no position whatever and those who do hold a position, as indicated by the chi square test.

Controls

Since one of the central hypotheses in the study relates to the association of involvement in the church program with tolerance of Negro residential proximity, a series of controls was devised to attempt to ascertain the influence on involvement and tolerance of certain other important variables. In the section on Frequency of Church

Attendance and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity the writer discusses in detail the results of controlling for involvement in the frequency of church attendance variable. When all of those who attend church every week were divided into a high, medium, and low involvement grouping, there was a significant difference between the high group and the two lower groups. The high involvement group had a mean tolerance score of 16.2, the medium involvement group a score of 13.6, and the low involvement group a score of 12.3.

A further explanation of this grouping arrangement is in order. It is the same grouping that is used in connection with two other control procedures. From the writer's experience as a member and a minister of several Methodist churches it is his feeling that the persons most likely to be the most highly involved in the church program--from the standpoint of the time and energy they devote to it--are those who are officers of the church; officers of a commission, committee, or organization in the church; and teachers and officers in the church school. Hence, the writer has designated the respondents in these three groups as having "high involvement." After all these respondents had been separated from the total those remaining who were members of a commission or committee, who were members of the Official Board, or who listed themselves as holding some other position were designated as


having "medium involvement." It is the writer's observation that persons in such posts are less likely to be highly involved in the church program than are those designated as the "high involvement" group. Finally, all those who indicated they held no position in their local church were designated as having "low involvement."

The writer determined on controlling in the "involvement in the church program" variable for "good acquaintance or friendship with Negroes." This latter variable achieves the highest degree of association with tolerance of Negro residential proximity of any of the variables in the study. Hence, it was conjectured that it could be a hidden influence in producing the association between involvement and tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

Table 17 shows the results of this control. "Involvement" and "tolerance" are found to be significantly associated. The "high involvement" group proved to be more tolerant than the two lower groups. However, taking the 93 persons who have Negro acquaintances or friends we find there is no significant difference between those in their number who are high in involvement and those in the two lower involvement groups. Those respondents with Negro acquaintances or friends tended to be tolerant even though not involved in the program of the church. Those without such associations tended to be more tolerant if they were

TABLE 17

THE ASSOCIATION OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE CHURCH PROGRAM AND
TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY,
CONTROLLING FOR ACQUAINTANCE-FRIENDSHIP

Association	No.	Chi Square	d.f. ^a	p ^b = 
"Involvement" and "Tolerance" of total group.....	232	7.24	2	.05
"Involvement" and "Tolerance" of respondents who have good acquaintances or friends who are Negroes	93	.15	2	n.s. ^c
"Involvement" and "Tolerance" of respondents who do not have good acquaintances or friends who are Negroes.....	139	9.71	2	.01

^ad.f. = degrees of freedom.

^bp = probability of occurrence of null hypothesis.

^cn.s. = not significant.

involved in the church program.

The significant finding in this control is this: taking the 139 respondents who do not have Negro acquaintances or freinds we find there still obtains a significant difference between the "high involvement" group and the two lower involvement groups. This finding indicates that the acquaintance-friendship variable is not a "contaminating factor" or a hidden influence in producing the association between "involvement in the church program" and tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

It was also conjectured that the education variable might be a hidden influence in the relationship between "involvement" and "tolerance." The study found an association between education and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. Hence it was felt that those who were high in involvement (leadership positions) might tend to be the predominantly college-educated who had proved to be more tolerant than those who had no college education.

Table 18 shows the results of this control. "Involvement" and "tolerance" are found to be significantly associated. The "high involvement group" proved to be more tolerant than the two lower groups. However, taking the 164 persons who have had some college education we find there is no significant difference between those in their number who are highly involved and those in the two lower involvement groups. Doubtless, the indication here is that

TABLE 18

THE ASSOCIATION OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE CHURCH PROGRAM AND
TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY,
CONTROLLING FOR EDUCATION

Association	No.	Chi Square	d.f.	p = <
"Involvement" and "Tolerance" of total group.....	233	15.75	6	.02
"Involvement" and "Tolerance" of respondents who have had some college education.....	164	7.42	6	n.s.
"Involvement" and "Tolerance" of respondents who have had no college education.....	69	9.84	2	.01

both "involvement" and "college education" are associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

The significant finding here is this: taking the 69 respondents who do not have college education we find that a significant difference still exists between those who are highly involved in the church program and the two lower involvement groups. This finding indicates that the education variable is not a hidden influence in producing the association between "involvement" and tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

From an examination of the data the writer has come to feel that these two variables which have been controlled --"acquaintance-friendship with Negroes" and "college education"-- are the factors most likely to have had an unseen influence in the production of the association between "involvement" and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. In view of the fact they do not prove to be influential the writer feels he is in a much sounder position to contend that the association between "involvement" and "tolerance" is a significant one.

The writer has found only one other study relating the individual's role in his church with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. This is Friedrich's study of a suburban New Jersey community's attitudes toward residential and educational segregation. He concluded that the individual's church role influences his tolerance of Negro

residential proximity. He classified 85 per cent of study group members as tolerant, 50 per cent of governing board members, 45 per cent of church school teachers, 44 per cent of merely Sunday church goers, 27 per cent of those whose activity beyond worship was limited to church societies.¹ It should be noted that the number of respondents in three of these categories was less than 15. Due to the different involvement categories used and different scoring procedures, it is not possible to make direct comparisons between Friedrich's study and the present one with respect to involvement in the church program. However, it is noteworthy that those respondents in Friedrich's study who are more highly involved in the church program appear to be more tolerant than those who are less highly involved.

The findings in this section tend to support one of the major hypotheses of the present study. That is, that a high degree of involvement in religious activity is directly related to tolerance of minority groups; that those persons who are highly involved are more tolerant of Negro residential proximity than are either the conventionally religious or the fringe members.

It seems quite possible to the writer that present in the group who are highly involved in the church program are many persons whom Allport depicts as "intrinsic"

¹Friedrichs, "Christians and Residential Exclusion," op. cit., p. 19.

religious types.¹ That is, those people who are willing to sacrifice time and energy to the work of the church may well contain a higher proportion of those having a deeper-than-average religious faith, as compared with those persons in the church who do not make this kind of contribution. The latter group may well contain a high proportion of the "extrinsic" religious types who perceive religion as something which is to serve them.² Moreover, it is possible that those who are more highly involved in their church program thereby become more receptive to the religious values which can enable them to challenge the norms of their reference groups which are often at variance with religious norms. It is a common observation among ministers, the writer believes, that those who are willing to shoulder the work of their church are, as a group, more deeply religious than those who are not so willing and not so involved.

It augurs well for the success of social action within the Methodist denomination on this problem that local church leaders seem to be the most tolerant group within the church. It is the writer's impression that some ministers and denominational leaders might be more willing to grapple with this problem if they felt local church

¹Allport, "Religion and Prejudice," op. cit., pp. 1-10.

²Ibid.

leaders were not strongly opposed. Certainly, prospects for any effective social action in the area would be less bright if the situation were reversed and the leaders appeared to be the least likely to be tolerant of Negro residential proximity.

It should be recalled, however, in assessing the resources for support on this issue within the laity, that Methodist church members in this sample are generally not tolerant of Negro residential proximity. Even that group of leaders who are weekly church attenders and who are highly involved in the church program achieve only a 16.2 mean tolerance score. This is a significantly higher tolerance score than the scores achieved by the groups who are less highly involved, but it still falls within the "Mildly Intolerant" division on the tolerance of Negro residential proximity scale.

Residential Proximity and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity

Residential proximity to Negroes is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The difference between those respondents who report living less than one half mile from the nearest Negro family and those who report living one half mile or more away is significant at the 5 per cent level. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association shows an association of .14 between residential proximity and tol-

erance of Negro residential proximity. The respondents living closest to Negroes were the most tolerant.

Table 19 shows the relationship between this variable and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. An examination of the raw data indicated that the significant difference in these residential proximity groups was most likely to occur between those who lived less than one half mile from the nearest Negro family and those who lived one half mile or more away. Moreover, to attain a sufficient number of respondents for the execution of the chi square test it was necessary to collapse the first two groups--those who had the nearest Negro family living in their neighborhood and those who had the nearest Negro family living just outside their neighborhood but less than one half mile away.

Table 19 shows that those who report they live closest to Negroes appear to be the most tolerant of Negro residential proximity. The number of those reporting a Negro family in their neighborhood is very small (13), but 8 of these respondents fall in the highest division on the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant) and only 3 fall in the two lowest divisions combined (Intolerant and Very Intolerant). Of the 23 persons reporting the nearest Negro family just outside their neighborhood but less than one half mile away, 14 are in the two upper divisions of the Tolerance Scale and 9 are in the two lowest divisions. In compari-

TABLE 19
LIVING NEAR NEGROES AND TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Nearest Negro Family ^a	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Totals	
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage
In respondent's neighborhood.....	8	61.5	2	15.4	1	7.7	2	15.4	13	4.9
Just outside his neighborhood but less than one half mile away.....	6	26.1	8	34.8	5	21.7	4	17.3	23	8.6
One half to one mile away.	13	29.5	7	15.9	6	13.6	18	40.9	44	16.5
Over one mile but less than three miles away...	19	20.7	18	19.6	18	19.6	37	40.2	92	34.6
Three miles or more away..	20	25.6	14	17.9	12	15.4	32	41.0	78	29.3
Total.....	66	49	42	93	250	93.9 ^b

$$\chi^2 = 8.65; \text{d.f.} = 3; p = < .05$$

^aFor purposes of the chi square test the categories were collapsed into two divisions: less than one half mile, and one half mile and over.

^bSixteen respondents (6.0 per cent) did not answer the question.

son, those respondents who are in the categories one half to 1 mile away, over 1 mile but less than 3 miles away, and 3 miles or more away (214) appear to be considerably less tolerant of Negro residential proximity. These three groups, it will be noted, have 54.5 per cent, 59.8 per cent, and 56.4 per cent, respectively, in the two lowest divisions of the Tolerance Scale (Intolerant and Very Intolerant).

In this consideration of residential proximity to Negroes it is interesting to analyze the tolerance scores and degree of residential proximity of the 26 respondents who are members of the two churches located in neighborhoods where Negroes reside. Of these 26 respondents, all but two report the nearest Negro family living within one mile. Nineteen report a Negro family in their neighborhood. Of this group of 19, there are 15 in the two highest divisions of the Tolerance Scale and only 4 in the two lowest divisions. It should also be remembered that this group of 26 respondents has a mean tolerance score of 18, as compared with a score of 13.6 obtained by the 266 respondents from the 9 churches located in neighborhoods where Negroes do not reside. This difference was found to be significant at the one tenth of 1 per cent level.

It is, of course, recognized that other factors may enter in at this point. Each of the two churches represented by the 26 respondents has a few Negro members. Presumably, these respondents have had an opportunity to

encounter Negroes in that setting. Also proximity may lead to other forms of social contact which in turn may be productive of more tolerant attitudes.

In a study of four low-rent public housing projects in New York City and Newark, New Jersey, Deutsch and Collins found a difference in racial attitudes and conduct between those persons living in the projects which were racially integrated and those living in projects which had internal segregation of the races. In the former projects there were more instances of friendly contacts between the races, there existed an atmosphere more favorable to friendly interracial associations, the project community was more closely knit, whites exhibited more favorable attitudes toward both Negroes within and without the project, and whites showed more favorable attitudes toward living in an interracial setting.¹

Wilner, Walkley, and Cook conducted a study designed as a parallel and as a partial replication of the Deutsch and Collins study. They investigated low-rent public housing projects in New England and a Middle Atlantic state. They found that more of those whites living near Negro families than of those living relatively far from them: had some type of contact, had intimate contacts, perceived the social atmosphere as favorable to interracial association,

¹Deutsch, op. cit., pp. 122-23.

had a favorable image of the Negroes in the project, had favorable feelings toward those Negroes, had favorable attitudes toward whites and Negroes living in the same community, and had favorable attitudes to Negroes in general.¹

Significantly, their investigation also showed that these differences in attitudes could not be laid to an initial difference in attitudes or to persons less favorably disposed to Negroes moving out of the project.²

Somewhat different findings have been reported elsewhere. In a study of five contiguous residential areas in Chicago, Kramer found that those in areas nearest to and farthest from Negroes had the least prejudice. Negroes had recently moved into the area under study and the findings were interpreted to mean that those in the three intermediate zones were the most apprehensive about Negroes moving in, and therefore the most prejudiced. Those in zone 5, the most distant, were considered to have an "average" amount of prejudice. Those in zone 1, where some Negroes lived, were felt to have had their apprehensions reduced by the actual experience of living near Negroes.³

¹Wilner, op. cit., pp. 147-48.

²Ibid., p. 148.

³Ibid., citing B. M. Kramer, "Residential Contact as a Determinant of Attitudes toward Negroes" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1951), pp. 159-60.

Winder employed a similar study design in a situation similar to the one studied by Kramer, also in Chicago. He, too, found least prejudice among those respondents who lived nearest to and farthest from Negroes.¹ It should be noted that in both the Kramer and Winder studies the immigration of Negroes was seen as threat to the white residents and there was also present the factor of competition for a scarce housing supply.

There is no support in the present study for some of these findings above which indicate a high degree of tolerance on the part of those who live farthest from Negroes. However, the present study does lend some support to findings such as those of Deutsch and Collins; and Wilner, Walkley, and Cook, that those who live close to Negroes are likely to have more favorable attitudes toward Negro residential proximity than are those who do not live in close proximity to Negroes.

Table 19 also shows that few of the respondents in this study live near Negroes. Those reporting Negroes in their neighborhoods are 4.9 per cent. Those reporting the nearest Negroes living just outside their neighborhood but less than one half mile away number 8.6 per cent. The figure for the one half mile to 1 mile away group is 16.5 per

¹Ibid., p. 160, citing A. E. Winder, "White Attitudes toward Negro-White Interaction in an Area of Changing Racial Composition," American Psychologist, VII (1952), 330-31.

cent, for the over 1 mile but less than three group is 34.6 per cent, and for the over 3 miles away group it is 29.3 per cent. Thus, over 80 per cent of the respondents from the 9 churches in racially segregated neighborhoods report living at least one half mile away from the nearest Negro family.

Education and Tolerance of Negro

Residential Proximity

Education is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The difference between those who had some college education or more and those who had no college work is significant at the 5 per cent level, as indicated by the chi square test. Those having college education appear to be the more tolerant. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association finds an association of .14 between education and tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

Table 20 shows the relationship between these two variables. An examination of the raw data indicated that the significant difference in the educational level groups was likely to occur at the point of division between the group which had been graduated from high school and the group which had some college training. In order to successfully apply the chi square test it was necessary, at any rate, to collapse the first two groups (those who did

TABLE 20
EDUCATION AND TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Education ^a	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Totals	
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage
Did not complete high school	1	3.7	7	25.9	7	25.9	12	44.4	27	10.2
Completed high school	12	25.0	5	10.4	7	14.6	24	50.0	48	18.0
Had some college work	32	31.4	21	20.6	16	15.7	33	32.4	102	38.3
Completed college	9	20.5	13	29.5	6	13.6	16	36.4	44	16.5
One year or more graduate work	14	41.2	6	17.6	6	17.6	8	23.5	34	12.8
Total	68	52	42	93	255	95.8 ^b

$$\chi^2 = 8.61; \text{d.f.} = 3; p = < .05$$

^aFor purposes of the chi square test the educational categories were collapsed into two divisions: those with no college and those with some college.

^bEleven respondents (4.1 per cent) did not answer the question on education.

not finish high school and those who had been graduated from high school), inasmuch as the number in the former group was below the minimum necessary for the test of significance.

An examination of Table 20 indicates that the group which did not complete high school appears to be the least tolerant of Negro residential proximity. Only 3.7 per cent of their number fall in the highest division of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant). Only 29.6 per cent of their number are in the two highest divisions combined, whereas 70.3 per cent fall in the two lowest divisions.

Although the group which had been graduated from high school have 25 per cent in the highest division, they have 50 per cent in the lowest division on the Tolerance Scale. The group which had some college appear to have attitudes similar to those who had been graduated from college, though there is a slightly heavier concentration of the former in the highest division (Tolerant).

By far, the heaviest concentration in that highest division is the 41.2 per cent scored by those who have one or more years of graduate work. Although the numbers involved are not large, an interesting comparison can be made when the number of respondents in the highest division of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant) is observed for the lowest and the highest educational level groups. Of the 27 in the "did not finish high school" group, 1 is "tolerant." Of the 34 who had "1 year or more graduate work," 14 are "tolerant."

This finding, that persons having at least some college education score higher than those of lower educational attainment in tolerance of Negro residential proximity, is not surprising. Most studies which have considered the education variable in relation to tolerance have found that college education and tolerance have a positive association.¹ Allport lists this as one of the very few demographic variables which demonstrates a generally consistent relationship to tolerance. He does qualify this by adding that at least persons with college education answer questions in a more tolerant way.²

The writer has been unable to locate any studies in which the education variable has been related to tolerance of Negro residential proximity. It is possible that the degree of association found between education and tolerance in this study is no higher than it is (.14) partly because of the social class factor which is present. That is to say, higher educational attainment may here reflect middle class social status. Some students of race relations feel that the middle class is less tolerant of Negro residential proximity than are lower socio-economic groups, even though the latter may be more prejudiced against Negroes in other respects.

¹Selltiz, op. cit., pp. 310-11.

²Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, op. cit., p. 80.

Some observers hold that there is no clear-cut relationship between tolerance and social class membership,¹ others point to a number of studies which have found that whites in the lower socio-economic strata are likely to express stronger prejudice toward Negroes than whites in the upper levels. Indeed, Allport lists this as one of only three demographic variables which usually evidence a consistent relationship to tolerance.² If one were to accept the latter position as valid he might anticipate that those with college education would be in the upper socio-economic levels and would therefore evidence a higher tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The fact that the present study found the groups with a lower educational attainment to be less tolerant could be interpreted as lending some support to this theory. However, the degree of association found here between education and tolerance of Negro residential proximity is not high.

One interpretation of this latter finding is that the middle class is peculiarly threatened by Negro residential proximity. Glazer holds that lower class whites are not as threatened by the prospect of racially integrated neighborhoods because they do not hold the same values that middle class whites hold:

The values of a middle-class neighborhood include such

¹Simpson, op. cit., p. 148.

²Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, op. cit., p. 80.

things as quiet, protection from violence, cleanliness, and good schools--none of which exist in the slums, where there is consequently nothing to protect against the presumed impact of nonwhite invasion.¹

In his 1959 Detroit study Lensky found that lower class whites were less disturbed about the prospect of racial residential integration than were middle class whites.² Friedrich's study of a New Jersey middle class suburb found only 46 per cent of the respondents not opposed to residential proximity of Negroes,³ in comparison to percentages of 58 and 59 per cent found by recent nationwide studies which sampled all of the class groups in the North and West.⁴

Since the respondents in the present study are drawn principally from the middle class, it is possible that this is partly responsible for the fact that there is no higher association between education and tolerance of Negro residential proximity than there is. The middle class is status conscious and much concerned with upward social mobility. Nevertheless, the fact remains that this study does find a significant association between education and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The hypothesis that those with college education are more tolerant than

¹Glazer, op. cit., p. 5.

²Lensky, op. cit., p. 65.

³Friedrichs, "Christians and Residential Exclusion," op. cit., p. 18.

⁴Supra, p. 110.

those who have not had such education is thereby supported.

Age and Tolerance of Negro Residential Proximity

This study finds age to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The difference between those who are in the 20-29 age group and all those 30 and over is significant at the 5 per cent level, as determined by the chi square test. The younger age group is the more tolerant. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association finds an association of .13 between age and tolerance.

Table 21 shows the relationship between the two variables. The 20-29 age group has 64.3 per cent of its number in the two highest divisions of the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant and Mildly Intolerant). The four older groups range between 38 and 46.8 per cent in these same two divisions.

Both Berry¹ and Allport² hold that age is one of the demographic variables that shows no conclusively consistent relationship to tolerance. In Tumin's intensive study of white males' attitudes toward desegregation in North Carolina in 1957 it was found that age was relatively

¹Brewton Berry, Race and Ethnic Relations (2nd ed.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958), p. 376.

²Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, op. cit., p. 79.

TABLE 21
AGE AND TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Age ^a	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Totals	
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage
20 to 29.....	12	38.7	8	25.6	6	19.3	5	16.1	31	11.7
30 to 39.....	16	25.8	13	21.0	11	17.7	22	35.5	62	23.3
40 to 49.....	11	22.0	8	16.0	11	22.0	20	40.0	50	18.8
50 to 59.....	14	26.9	8	15.4	10	19.2	20	38.5	52	19.5
60 or over.....	15	22.4	14	20.9	10	14.9	28	41.8	67	25.2
Total.....	68	51	48	95	262	98.5 ^b

$$\chi^2 = 7.94; \text{ d.f. } = 3; p = < .05$$

^aFor purposes of the chi square test the age categories were collapsed into two divisions: 20 to 29; and 30 and over.

^bFour respondents (1.5 per cent) did not answer the question on age or were under 20.

unimportant as a factor.¹ Only the group who were over age 65 had a uniformly unfavorable attitude toward Negroes. In the present study the writer finds little difference in the attitudes of all the groups age 30 and over.

The writer found only one study which relates the age variable to tolerance of Negro residential proximity. In their study Ben Gaffin and Associates found age to be directly associated with willingness to live in the same neighborhood with Negroes, in both the North and the South. In the North, for example, 66 per cent of the 15-34 age group were willing, and 49 per cent of those in the 55 and over age group. The same trend, with reduced percentage figures, was evidenced with respect to willingness to live next door to Negroes.²

The findings in the present study lend some support to the hypothesis that younger adults are higher in tolerance of Negro residential proximity than are older adults. However, the writer had anticipated the possibility of a stronger degree of intolerance among older adults than was evidenced. The fact that the 20-29 age group is more tolerant of Negro residential proximity is seen partly as a result of the "liberality" of youth, partly as a result of the trend toward tolerance in the life of our nation in the past two decades, and possibly due in part to the increased

¹Tumin, op. cit., pp. 56-59.

²New York University, op. cit., p. 10.

emphasis on racial brotherhood within the Methodist denomination within the same general time period.

Frequency of Church Attendance and Tolerance
of Negro Residential Proximity

Frequency of church attendance is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity (however, this statistical finding is modified by a later introduction of a control for involvement in the church program). It appears that those who attend church twice a month or more are more tolerant than those who attend less often. The chi square test finds the difference between these two groups to be significant at the 5 per cent level. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association finds an association of .13 between frequency of church attendance and tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

Table 22 shows the relationship between these two variables. For purposes of the chi square test it was necessary to combine the three lowest groups on the table. These three were compared with those who attend every Sunday or twice a month. It will be observed from Table 22 that 32.6 per cent of those who attend every Sunday are in the highest division on the Tolerance Scale (Tolerant). All of the other attendance groups, with the exception of those who attend only on special days or never, have fewer than 20 per cent in this division. Those who attend twice a month

TABLE 22
CHURCH ATTENDANCE AND TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Frequency of Church Attendance ^a	Tolerant		Mildly Intolerant		Intolerant		Very Intolerant		Totals	
	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage	Number	Per- centage
Once a week or more	47	32.6	20	13.9	30	20.8	47	32.6	144	54.1
Twice monthly	8	19.0	17	40.5	5	11.9	12	28.6	42	15.8
Once a month	1	4.2	3	12.5	7	29.1	13	54.2	24	9.1
Several times a year	6	16.6	9	25.0	4	11.1	17	47.2	36	13.5
Special days only or never	5	33.3	3	20.0	1	6.7	6	40.0	15	5.6
Total	67	52	47	95	261	98.1 ^b

$$\chi^2 = 8.01; \text{d.f.} = 3; p = < .05$$

^aFor purposes of the chi square test the attendance categories were collapsed into two divisions: once a week or more and twice monthly; and once a month, several times a year, and special days only or never.

^bFive respondents (1.9 per cent) did not answer the question on attendance.

present an unusual scoring pattern. Only 19 per cent are in the highest division, but 40.5 per cent are in the second highest division (Mildly Intolerant). Those who attend once a month or several times a year appear to be the least tolerant. The number in the former category is small (24), but 83.3 per cent of them fall in the two lowest divisions on the Tolerance Scale (Intolerant and Very Intolerant).

Table 23 presents the data in a different form. A mean tolerance score was computed for each of the five attendance groups shown in Table 22. Then the statistical test of the difference between two means was applied where it was relevant. It can be seen from Table 23 that the scores are as follows: once a week, 14.5; twice a month, 14.2; once a month, 9.5; several times a year, 11.5; and special days or never, 14.5. No significant difference was found between the once weekly and twice a month group. However, the difference between the once weekly and once a month group is significant at the 1 per cent level. The once weekly group is the more tolerant of the two. The difference between the once weekly and several times a year group is found to be significant at the 1 per cent level. The mean tolerance scores for the once weekly group and the special days or never group is the same, 14.5. However, it is noted that the number in the latter group is only 15.

Table 23 does show a definite curvilinear relationship between frequency of church attendance and tolerance

TABLE 23

FREQUENCY OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE AND TOLERANCE OF
NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY

Frequency of Church Attendance	Num- ber	Mean Tolerance Score
Once a week or more	144	14.5
Twice monthly	42	14.2
Once a month	24	9.5
Several times a year	36	11.5
Special days only or never	15	14.5

Note: In applying the test of the difference between two means, the difference between "once a week or more" and "twice monthly" is not significant ($Z = .27\sigma$); the difference between "once a week or more" and "once a month" is significant at the one tenth of 1 per cent level ($Z = 5.7\sigma$); the difference between "once a week or more" and "several times a year" is significant at the 1 per cent level ($Z = 2.5\sigma$).

of Negro residential proximity. The more tolerant respondents are at both ends of the continuum. To the writer's knowledge, Friedrichs is the only other researcher who has investigated this specific relationship. However, several investigators have found a similar curvilinear relationship between frequency of church attendance and other aspects of tolerance.

Holtzman found the following proportions of University of Texas students intolerant toward non-segregation (grouping by frequency of church attendance): once weekly or more, 49 per cent; about twice monthly, 67 per cent; about once monthly, 66 per cent; important holidays, 49 per cent; and never or almost never, 37 per cent. He also points out that this curvilinear relationship has been ignored by many investigators. He says that Adorno, et. al., are guilty of this in The Authoritarian Personality and summarizes some of their own data in a table which shows the curvilinear relationship of frequency of church attendance and ethnocentrism. In their study, the higher the ethnocentrism score, the higher the intolerance: attend regularly, 3.79; attend often, 4.14; attend seldom, 3.94; attend never, 2.87.¹

An examination of Tumin's data by the writer shows that on four of the five scales he used to measure atti-

¹Holtzman, op. cit., p. 566.

tudes toward the Negro there is a pronounced curvilinear relationship between frequency of church attendance and tolerance. For example, in measuring the image of the Negro held by the white respondents (where the lower the score the more favorable the image) he found the following: once weekly or more, 2.52; more than once a month but less than once a week, 2.91; less than once a month, 2.92; and never, 2.81.¹

Friedrich's findings relate directly to church members' attitudes toward Negro residential proximity. He found that the following proportions would not object to a Negro family moving into their neighborhood: attended 61 or more services a year, 64 per cent; attended 31 to 60 times, 38 per cent; attended 11 to 30 times, 44 per cent; attended 1 to 10 times, 51 per cent; and attended never, 50 per cent. Again, the curvilinear relationship is pronounced.²

In order to see if "involvement in the church program" might be a variable which was exerting a hidden influence on the production of an association between frequency of church attendance and tolerance of Negro residential proximity, the "involvement" variable was introduced as a control in the group which attended every Sunday. It will be remembered that this group had the highest mean

¹Tumin, op. cit., p. 64.

²Friedrichs, "Christians and Residential Exclusion," op. cit., p. 19.

tolerance score of any of the attendance groups (14.5) with the exception of the relatively few respondents in the lowest attendance group who had an identical score.

Three "involvement" groups were designated by the writer: a group who were highly involved in the program of the church, a group who were considered to have a medium involvement, and a low involvement group.¹

Table 24 reports the findings. Those every Sunday attenders who are in the high involvement group have a mean tolerance score of 16.2. Those in the medium involvement group have a score of 13.6 (coincidentally this is the exact score achieved by the total respondents in the study). Those in the lowest involvement group have a mean tolerance score of 12.3. The difference between the means of the high group as compared with the lower two groups is found to be significant at the 5 per cent level.

These findings lend support to the theory that church attendance, per se, may not provide the best index for measuring religiosity. Unfortunately, many social investigators seem to use it almost exclusively. Clearly, those persons in this sample who attend every Sunday but who do not otherwise become involved in their church program score rather low in tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The medium involvement group here falls in the

¹Supra, p. 162 for details on the composition of the three "involvement" groups.

TABLE 24
WEEKLY CHURCH ATTENDANCE AND TOLERANCE OF NEGRO RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY
BY INVOLVEMENT IN THE CHURCH PROGRAM

Degree of Involvement	Num- ber	Mean Tolerance Score
Weekly attendance and high involvement group	60	16.2
Weekly attendance and medium involvement group	35	13.6
Weekly attendance and low involvement group	39	12.3

Note: In the test of the difference between the means of the high involvement group (16.2) and the medium involvement group (13.6), $Z = 1.77\sigma$; $p = < .05$.

"Intolerant" division of the Tolerance Scale, with a score of 13.6. The high involvement group makes a markedly better showing. However, their mean tolerance score of 16.2 places them in the lower part of the "Mildly Intolerant" division on the Tolerance Scale. Nevertheless, the writer feels these findings lend limited support to the hypothesis that conventional religious activity is related inversely to tolerance of minority groups and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The writer interprets conventional religious activity in this context as regular church going with a lack of depth involvement in the work of the church.

Those who attend church regularly score higher in tolerance of Negro residential proximity than those who do not. However, when a control for involvement in the church program is introduced, it appears that regular church attendance, per se, is not vitally associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

Variables Found Not Significant

Eight variables included in the study for a consideration of their relationship with tolerance of Negro residential proximity were found not to have a significant relationship. The chi square test of statistical significance found this for the following: sex, geographic origin, age of children in the family, presence of children in the family, attendance of children in the family at a school

where Negroes are enrolled, occupation, income and value of home.

Comments are in order on two of these variables which are commonly assumed to be related to tolerance. Those respondents who had lived longest in the Southeast and Southcentral sections of the country did appear to be less tolerant of Negro residential proximity than those whose geographic origins were elsewhere. However, the writer was surprised to find that only 15 of the 266 respondents reported having lived longest in the South. This number was too small for statistical testing.

As has been indicated, economic status is often held to be related to tolerance of Negroes. Lower economic groups are considered to be more prejudiced than higher groups. In this study the lower economic strata were definitely under represented. Only 13.5 per cent of the respondents reported having annual incomes under \$5,000. Many of these were retired persons. Hence, it was not possible to make a meaningful comparison between the extremes on the economic spectrum.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Involved in this study of the attitudes of white Methodist church members in selected Los Angeles metropolitan area churches toward residential segregation of the Negro were a total of 292 respondents from 11 churches. The main data analysis, however, was carried out on the 266 respondents from the nine churches located in neighborhoods where Negroes did not reside. These 266 respondents represented a percentage return of 43.9 per cent of the questionnaires mailed to their group. The churches were selected by a purposive, non-probability sampling technique. A 10 per cent simple random sample was drawn from the adult membership of each church.

A scale purporting to measure attitudes toward "tolerance of Negro residential proximity" was constructed by the writer for use in the questionnaire. This was a summated, Likert-type scale. From it a "mean tolerance score" was derived for each respondent. This made it possible to determine which of the variables included in the study were significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. In addition, other important attitudes toward

residential segregation of the Negro were studied.

The data were subjected to chi square analysis and the 5 per cent level of statistical significance was accepted for the study. Tschuprow's T test for degree of association between two variables was employed. The statistical test of the difference between two means was also used where applicable.

Summary of the Findings

1. The study finds a significant difference between respondents who are members of churches located in neighborhoods where Negroes reside and those in churches located in neighborhoods where Negroes do not reside. The difference is significant at the one tenth of 1 per cent level. Although the number of respondents from the two churches located in integrated neighborhoods is small (26), they appear to be markedly more tolerant of Negro residential proximity than the 266 respondents from the nine churches in racially segregated neighborhoods. This finding lends support to the hypothesis that experience in living in a racially mixed neighborhood is directly related to favorable attitudes toward living in such neighborhoods.

2. The principal focus of the study was on the attitudes of the 266 white respondents who were members of the nine churches located in racially segregated neighborhoods. Measured by the scale constructed by the writer, only about one quarter of the respondents are found to be

clearly tolerant of Negro residential proximity. Slightly more than one half are distinctly intolerant of Negro residential proximity. The remainder appear to be mildly intolerant. Since the respondents' religion advocates tolerance, the writer feels this finding supports the hypothesis that the respondents' cultural values transcend their religious values at this point.

3. Slightly more than one half of the respondents express disapproval of a Negro family, of similar education and income, moving into their neighborhood. This refutes the writer's hypothesis that a majority would not disapprove. This also indicates that the respondents are less willing to accept Negro neighbors than is the average white, as indicated in nationwide studies. However, the sparse amount of research relating to church members' attitudes on the subject indicates the respondents in this study have attitudes similar to other church members. Moreover, there is a possibility that urban residents are less tolerant than the national average.

4. Although their own reluctance to accept Negro neighbors is considerable, the respondents perceive their neighbors' attitudes on the question as much more intolerant. In the light of other research, this assessment appears unrealistic.

5. Whereas slightly more than one half would disapprove of Negroes moving into their neighborhood, slightly

less than one third indicate they would be likely to move their residence if it happened.

6. The great majority of respondents feel Negroes moving into their neighborhood would be likely to (or at least have an even chance to) result in: lowered property values, many of their neighbors moving away, and a lowering of the social standing of the neighborhood.

7. The great majority of respondents do not feel that Negro movement into their neighborhood would result in increased crime and delinquency, increased disease, or intermarriage.

8. Only about one fifth of the respondents view residential segregation of the Negro as a serious social problem. Another one fifth, approximately, consider it a mild social problem. Almost one half state categorically that it is not a social problem. The respondents rank it below air pollution, traffic congestion, and use of alcoholic beverages in its importance as a community problem. These findings lend some support to the hypothesis that not enough has been done by national, community, and church leaders to create an awareness of the crucial nature of the problem.

9. With respect to what they feel the role of their local churches should be in relation to the problem, the overwhelming majority of respondents say their churches should welcome Negroes moving into the neighborhood into

membership in the church and should preach and teach brotherhood. The overwhelming majority also feel their church should not take action to resist Negro immigration. Only a handful would support their churches taking direct social action (such as picketing) to support Negroes' rights to live in the neighborhood of their choice. Sentiment is about evenly divided, with one fifth abstaining, on the issue of their churches passing a resolution favoring "Fair Housing" legislation. These findings support the hypothesis that the overwhelming majority of Methodists do not view aggressive social action as a legitimate function of the local church.

10. The variable found to have the highest degree of association with tolerance of Negro residential proximity is "good acquaintance or friendship with Negroes." Those who have such a relationship are much more tolerant than those who do not. The difference in the two groups is significant at the one tenth of 1 per cent level. This lends strong support to the hypothesis that equal status contact with Negroes is directly related to tolerant attitudes toward Negroes and to tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

11. Working closely with Negroes (or the head of the respondent's household doing so) at their place of employment is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. Those who have

such contact are more tolerant than those who do not. The difference between the two groups is significant at the 1 per cent level.

12. Home ownership is significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. Those who rent a house or apartment are found to be more tolerant than those who own or are purchasing their homes. This lends support to the hypothesis that owners exhibit less willingness to live in neighborhoods where Negroes are moving in than do renters. The significance level is 1 per cent.

13. The respondents' involvement in the church program is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. High, medium, and low involvement groups were tested and the high group proved to be the most tolerant. The difference between it and the two lower groups was significant at the 5 per cent level. Moreover, those persons who are officers of a commission, committee or organization in the church are found to be more tolerant than those who are not. This difference is significant at the 1 per cent level. The same held for teachers and officers of the church school when they were compared with all those who held no such position. It was conjectured that the variables of "good acquaintance or friendship with Negroes" and "education" might be hidden influences in the association between "involvement" and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. However, when

these two variables were controlled a significant association still obtained. These findings lend support to a major hypothesis of the study: A high degree of involvement in religious activity is directly related to tolerance of minority groups and to tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

14. Residential proximity to Negroes is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. Those who live less than one half mile from a Negro family are found to be more tolerant of Negro residential proximity than those who live at a greater distance. The difference is significant at the 5 per cent level.

15. Education is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. Those who have had some college education or more are found to be more tolerant than those with less education. The difference is significant at the 5 per cent level. This lends support to the hypothesis that persons who have college education exhibit more tolerant attitudes toward Negro residential proximity than do persons with less education.

16. Age is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. The 20-29 age is more tolerant than the groups age 30 and over. The difference is significant at the 5 per cent level. This gives some support to the hypothesis that the trend toward

tolerance in the nation and the Methodist Church in recent decades is reflected in a higher tolerance of Negro residential proximity in younger adult members than older ones.

17. Frequency of church attendance is found to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. Those who attend twice a month or more are more tolerant than those who attend less than twice a month. The difference is significant at the 5 per cent level. Moreover, a curvilinear relationship is found between frequency of church attendance and tolerance of Negro residential proximity. That is, those who attend church most frequently and those who attend least frequently tend to be the more tolerant. The group in the middle range of attendance presents the more intolerant attitudes. When a control for "involvement in the church program" is carried out in the group who attend church every week, those who are not highly involved rank considerably lower in tolerance than do those who are highly involved. This casts some doubt on the observed association between frequency of church attendance (per se) and tolerance of Negro residential proximity.

18. Eight variables are found not to be significantly associated with tolerance of Negro residential proximity. They are: sex, geographic origin, age of children in the family, presence of children in the family, attendance of children in the family at a school where

Negroes are enrolled, occupation, income, and value of home.

19. No solid support was found for the hypothesis that those persons who attend church frequently, but who are not highly involved in the church program, evidence less tolerance of Negro residential proximity than do those who attend rarely and are not at all involved. Both of these groups, however, were much lower in tolerance than the group who are regular attenders and highly involved.

20. There is little support in the findings for the hypothesis that the respondents are considerably less inclined to approve of Negroes moving next door than into the neighborhood.

21. There is some support for the hypothesis that one result of residential segregation of the Negro is a low degree of contact and social communication between whites and Negroes living in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Although a sizeable proportion report good acquaintance or friendship with Negroes, a small proportion seem to have close friends among Negroes.

Conclusions

Before stating the conclusions, the writer would again briefly indicate the limitations of the study. Only white, adult members of nine churches in one suburban section of the Los Angeles metropolitan area are studied

intensively here. Although the 10 per cent sample drawn from the membership lists of the churches was a simple random one, the churches themselves were selected by a purposive, non-probability sampling technique. Ideally, it should have been desirable to have done more controlling of variables. No attempt was made to assess the relationship between the character of the respondents' religious beliefs and their feelings about residential segregation of the Negro. The writer believes the data give a fairly accurate picture of the attitudes of the members of these nine churches. It is possible that the data may also represent to some degree the attitudes of Methodist church members in the general Los Angeles metropolitan area and other suburban Methodist church members in the North and the West. However, these latter two claims cannot be advanced with any degree of certainty.

The clear majority of respondents in the study are not tolerant of Negro residential proximity. The writer sees in the findings evidence of the accommodation to culture of the respondents' religious faith. Basic theological and ethical principles of the Christian faith stand in opposition to any form of segregation. Yet, the majority of the respondents favor residential segregation of the Negro. The writer feels that the findings support the contention that for many persons the church has become just one more reference group. Moreover, frequently a higher

significance seems to be attached to the values of other reference groups. When a church member has to make a choice between the doctrine of brotherhood, on the one hand, and the cultural norm of high social status, on the other, it appears that the latter usually triumphs. It is understandable that Negroes are becoming increasingly vocal in their resentment toward the large number of whites who pay only lip service to the brotherhood ideal. Baldwin writes:

Those white people who are in favor of integration prove to be in favor of it later, in some other city Negroes know how little most white people are prepared to implement their words with deeds, how little, when the chips are down, they are prepared to risk. And this long history of moral evasion has had an unhealthy effect on the total life of the country, and has eroded whatever respect Negroes may once have felt for white people.¹

The radical altruism which is implicit in the norm of Christian love is largely absent from the respondents' attitudes. They do not seem to sense the tension which exists between the norms of their faith and the norms of secular culture. The claims of love are denied and the claims of justice ignored.

It appears that their churches have largely failed to inculcate in the respondents any vital sense of the manner in which Christian faith is relevant to racial attitudes and conduct. Doubtless, the church is doing battle

¹Baldwin, op. cit., p. 77.

here with formidable opponents. In theological terms it is combating man's pride and his sinful attempt to deny oneness with his fellow man. In sociological terms it is attempting to counter such powerful forces as the drive for security, the inordinate concern with upward social mobility, traditional cultural attitudes regarding social distance from the Negro, countless rationalizations which result in such phenomena as compartmentalization, various psycho-social factors involved in the etiology of prejudice, and middle class values militating toward conformity and homogeneity in residential areas.

A transcendent, prophetic religion should hope to emerge from such a contest with a markedly better record of success than has been the case. It is encouraging, however, for those who would hope for some improvement in this record, that the persons who are most highly involved in the church program are significantly more tolerant than the church members who have only a medium or low involvement. The writer presumes that these persons have a deeper commitment to the Christian faith. In their strategic positions of leadership they constitute a resource for the minister or denominational leader who hopes to see the churches achieve some relevancy to this social and spiritual problem--residential segregation of the Negro.

Suggestions for Further Study

During this study the writer became aware of the significance of several other related problems which he feels bear further study.

1. A study to attempt to distinguish between church members' tolerance of Negro residential proximity and their general level of tolerance of Negroes.

2. A replication of the present study involving many other religious denominations.

3. A replication of the present study which would also involve a sample of non-church members.

4. A study in the Methodist denomination to determine the laity's readiness for a multiplicity of social action techniques with respect to specific social problems.

5. A study designed to see how church members relate their religious convictions to intolerance of Negro residential proximity.

6. Intensive study of a local church which has attempted to be a positive force for racial integration in its neighborhood, to determine the effectiveness of different approaches.

APPENDIX I

Facsimile of Cover Letter

16335 Elgenia Avenue
Covina, California

November 7, 1962

Dear Friend:

By a process of scientific sampling your name has been selected in connection with a research project conducted under the direction of the faculty at the Southern California School of Theology at Claremont. It is an opinion survey about race relations.

Much is known about the positions of various church leaders and conferences. However, we know little about what church members themselves think. After all, in taking positions churches should keep in mind the opinions of members.

Will you help in this scientific study by devoting a few minutes of your time to completing the enclosed survey? Since your name has been one of the comparatively few selected it is important that we get your answer.

The survey is completely anonymous. You will not be identified. Your honest opinions are what we need for accuracy.

Your prompt reply will be greatly appreciated, using the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope. We sincerely thank you for your contribution to this study.

Appreciatively yours,

Roger Ragan, Survey Director
Teaching Assistant in Social Ethics
Southern California School of Theology

P.S. Experiments show that this survey takes only about eight minutes to complete. Would you be willing to do it now while it is on your mind? Thank you.

APPENDIX II

Facsimile of the Questionnaire

RACE RELATIONS OPINION SURVEY

Instructions

1. Do not sign your name.
2. Answer all questions at one sitting, if possible.
3. Use enclosed self-addressed envelope to return to: Roger Ragan, 16335 Elgenia, Covina, California.
4. Since the questions are spread out to allow answering by merely checking, the entire survey requires only about eight minutes to complete.

1. Sex: (check one)

☐ Male
☐ Female

2. Race: (check one)

☐ Caucasian (white)
☐ Negro
☐ Oriental

3. Age: (check one)

☐ Under 20 ☐ 40 to 49
☐ 20 to 29 ☐ 50 to 59
☐ 30 to 39 ☐ 60 or over

4. In what region of the country have you lived longest?
(check one)

☐ West Coast ☐ Northeast
☐ Rocky Mountain Area ☐ Southeast
☐ Midwest ☐ Southcentral
 ☐ Outside of U.S.A.

5. How often, on the average, do you attend the services
of your church? (check one)

☐ Once a week or more. ☐ Several times a year.
☐ Twice monthly. ☐ Special days only.
☐ Once a month. ☐ Never.

6. Check any of the following positions you hold in your church: (check one or more)

☐ Church school teacher or officer.
☐ Member of a commission or a committee.
☐ Member of the Official Board.
☐ Officer of the church.
☐ Officer of a commission, committee or organization.
☐ Other position.
☐ No position.

Please place a check in the appropriate column.	Strongly Disapprove	Mildly Disapprove	Would be Undecided	Mildly Approve	Strongly Approve
7. If a Negro family of similar education and income to that of your neighbors moved <u>into your neighborhood</u> , how do you think most of your neighbors would feel about it?					
8. If a Negro family of similar education and income to yours moved <u>into your neighborhood</u> , how would you feel about it yourself?					
9. If a Negro family of similar education and income moved in <u>next door</u> to a typical neighbor of yours, how do you think that neighbor would feel about it?					
10. If a Negro family of similar education and income moved in <u>next door</u> to you, how would you feel about it yourself?					

11. Do you think the fact that most Negroes live by themselves in separate sections of our communities is a social problem? (check one)

☐ Not a social problem.
☐ Mild social problem.
☐ Serious social problem.
☐ Undecided.

12. Which of the following are important problems facing our Southern California Communities? (Do not check, but list in order of importance - 1, 2, 3, etc.)

☐ Air pollution (smog).
☐ Use of beverage alcohol.
☐ Negroes' being concentrated in separate housing areas.
☐ Littering of highways and recreation areas.
☐ Traffic congestion.

After each statement place a check in the column that best expresses your reaction.	Strongly Agree	Mildly Agree	Undecided	Mildly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13. It would be unfair for anyone in my neighborhood to sell or rent a house to Negroes of similar education and income.					
14. A Negro family of similar education and income wouldn't be as happy living in my neighborhood as it would be living in a predominantly Negro neighborhood.					
15. If a Negro family of similar education and income moved into my neighborhood I would begin looking for a new home elsewhere.					
16. It is best for Negroes, no matter what their level of income and education, to live by themselves in one section of the community.					

Do you believe it is likely that any of the following situations would arise from Negroes, of similar education and income to that of your neighbors, moving into your neighborhood?

	Likely	50-50 Chance	Unlikely
17. Many of my neighbors would move away.			
18. It would provide a better setting to teach children American ideals.			
19. Property values would be lowered.			
20. It would be an opportunity to make new friends.			
21. The social standing of the neighborhood would be lowered.			
22. It would lead to inter-marriage.			
23. Crime and delinquency would increase.			
24. There would be more disease.			
25. Other. (Write in)_____.			

Should your own church use the following approaches in regard to those Negroes who want to be able to live wherever they can afford to? (check "Yes" or "No")

26. ____ Yes; ____ No Welcome any Negro families moving into the neighborhood into membership in the church.
27. ____ Yes; ____ No Picket a new housing tract that will not sell to Negroes.
28. ____ Yes; ____ No Do nothing.

29. ☐ Yes; ☐ No Pass a resolution opposing the entrance of Negroes into a white neighborhood.
30. ☐ Yes; ☐ No Preach and teach brotherhood.
31. ☐ Yes; ☐ No Cooperate with any groups who want to keep Negroes out of white neighborhoods.
32. ☐ Yes; ☐ No Pass a resolution favoring "Fair Housing" legislation.
33. ☐ Yes; ☐ No Other (write in) _____.

Do you or your family associate with Negroes in any of the following ways? (check "Yes" or "No")

34. ☐ Yes; ☐ No I have good acquaintances or friends who are Negroes.
35. ☐ Yes; ☐ No I (or the head of my household) work closely with Negroes on the job.
36. ☐ Yes; ☐ No Our child (children) attends a school where Negro children are enrolled.
37. ☐ Yes; ☐ No I have entertained a Negro socially in my home within the last two years.

38. How close would you say the nearest Negro family lives to you? (check one)

☐ In my neighborhood.

☐ Just outside my neighborhood, but less than $\frac{1}{2}$ mile away.

☐ $\frac{1}{2}$ mile to 1 mile away.

☐ Over 1 mile but less than 3 miles away.

☐ 3 miles or more away.

39. Are there children in your household in either or both of the following age groups? (check one or more)

☐ Under twelve.

☐ Twelve to eighteen.

☐ No children in these age groups.

40. How much education have you had? (check one)

- ☐ Did not finish high school.
- ☐ Graduated from high school.
- ☐ Had some college work.
- ☐ Graduated from college.
- ☐ 1 year or more graduate work.

41. What is your approximate total family yearly income?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under \$3,000. | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 7,500 to 9,999. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$3,000 to 4,999. | <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000 to 14,999. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$5,000 to 7,499. | <input type="checkbox"/> \$15,000 and over. |

42. What is your present living arrangement? (check one)

- ☐ Own or purchasing my own home.
- ☐ Own or purchasing my own apartment.
- ☐ Rent a house.
- ☐ Rent an apartment.
- ☐ Other.

43. If you own or are purchasing or renting a house, what is its approximate value? (check one)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under \$10,000. | <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,000 to 26,999. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000 to 14,999. | <input type="checkbox"/> \$27,000 to 34,999. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$15,000 to 19,999. | <input type="checkbox"/> \$35,000 or over. |

44. Occupation: (If housewife, give that of your husband. Please be specific. State type of work, for example auto mechanic, high school teacher, accountant, etc.)

_____.

Please feel free to use the back of the questionnaire to write any comments you wish to make. Thank you for your cooperation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Abrams, Charles. Forbidden Neighbors: A Study of Prejudice in Housing. New York: Harper & Bros., 1955.
- Adorno, T. W., et al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper & Bros., 1950.
- Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954.
- Baldwin, James. Nobody Knows My Name: More Notes of a Native Son. New York: The Dial Press, 1961.
- Berry, Brewton. Race and Ethnic Relations. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958.
- Bettelheim, Bruno, and Morris Janowitz. Dynamics of Prejudice: A Psychological and Sociological Study of Veterans. New York: Harper & Bros., 1950.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.
- Bogardus, Emory S. Immigration and Race Attitudes. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1928.
- Brunner, Emil. The Divine Imperative: A Study in Christian Ethics. Translated by Olive Wyon. London: The Lutterworth Press, 1937.
- Campbell, Ernest Q., and Thomas F. Pettigrew. Christians in Racial Crisis: A Study of Little Rock's Ministry. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1959.
- Cohen, Lillian. Statistical Methods for Social Scientists. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.
- Coser, Lewis, and Bernard Rosenberg (eds.). Sociological Theory. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1957.
- Cuber, John F. Sociology: A Synopsis of Principles. 3rd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955.

- Dean, John P., and Alex Rosen. A Manual of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Deutsch, Morton, and Mary Evans Collins. Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951.
- Dexter, Harriet Harmon. What's Right With Race Relations. New York: Harper & Bros., 1958.
- Doctrines and Discipline of The Methodist Church, 1960. Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1960.
- Edwards, Allen L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.
- Frazier, E. Franklin. The Negro in the United States. Rev. ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1957.
- _____. Race and Culture Contacts in the Modern World. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.
- Gallagher, Buell G. Color and Conscience: The Irrepressible Conflict. New York: Harper & Bros., 1946.
- Gardner, E. Clinton. Biblical Faith and Social Ethics. New York: Harper & Bros., 1960.
- Glazer, Nathan, and Davis McEntire (eds.). Studies in Housing and Minority Groups. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
- Grier, Eunice and George Grier. Privately Developed Interracial Housing. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
- Handlin, Oscar. The Newcomers: Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis (N.Y.C.). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Harkness, Georgia. Christian Ethics. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957.
- Haselden, Kyle. The Racial Problem in Christian Perspective. New York: Harper & Bros., 1959.

- Jahoda, Marie, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook (eds.). Research Methods in Social Relations. 2 vols. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.
- Johnson, Paul E. Christian Love. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951.
- Kardiner, Abram, and Lionel Ovesey. The Mark of Oppression: A Psychological Study of the American Negro. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1951.
- King, Martin Luther. Stride toward Freedom. New York: Harper & Bros., 1958.
- Klineberg, Otto (ed.). Characteristics of the American Negro. New York: Harper & Bros., 1944.
- Kroeber, A. L. Anthropology. Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1948.
- Laurenti, Luigi. Property Values and Race. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
- Lensky, Gerhard. The Religious Factor. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1961.
- Lincoln, C. Eric. The Black Muslims in America. Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.
- Lomax, Louis E. The Negro Revolt. New York: Harper & Bros., 1962.
- Long, Herman H., and Charles S. Johnson. People vs. Property. Nashville: Fisk University Press, 1947.
- Maston, T. B. Segregation and Desegregation: A Christian Approach. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959.
- McEntire, Davis. Residence and Race. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949.
- Muellder, Walter G. Foundations of the Responsible Society. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959.
- Mueller, John H., and Karl F. Schuessler. Statistical Reasoning in Sociology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.

- Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Bros., 1944.
- Pope, Liston. The Kingdom Beyond Caste. New York: The Friendship Press, 1957.
- Quinn, James A. Human Ecology. New York: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1950.
- Ramsey, Paul. Basic Christian Ethics. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.
- _____. Christian Ethics and the Sit-In. New York: Association Press, 1961.
- _____. (ed.). Faith and Ethics. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.
- Rapkin, Chester, and William G. Grigsby. The Demand for Housing in Racially Mixed Areas. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
- Redding, Saunders. The Lonesome Road. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1958.
- Rosen, Harry M. and David H. Rosen. But Not Next Door. New York: Ivan Obolensky, Inc., 1962.
- Saenger, Gerhart H. The Social Psychology of Prejudice. New York: Harper & Bros., 1953.
- Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. Rev. ed. New York: Henry Holt and Co., Inc., 1959.
- Simpson, George Eaton, and J. Milton Yinger. Racial and Cultural Minorities. Rev. ed. New York: Harper & Bros., 1958.
- Stotts, Herbert E., and Paul Deats, Jr. Methodism and Society: Guidelines for Strategy. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Tilson, Everett. Segregation and the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958.
- Troeltsch, Ernst. The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches. 2 vols. Translated by Olive Wyon. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931.

- Tumin, Melvin M. Desegregation: Resistance and Readiness. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1958.
- _____. Segregation and Desegregation: A Digest of Recent Research. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1957.
- UNESCO, Secretariat. Race and Science. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Vose, Clement E. Caucasians Only. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.
- Weaver, Robert C. The Negro Ghetto. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1948.
- Williams, Robin M., Jr. The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947.
- Wilner, Daniel M., et al. The Housing Environment and Family Life. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1962.
- _____, Rosabelle P. Walkley, and Stuart W. Cook, Human Relations in Interracial Housing. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955.
- Wogaman, J. Philip. Methodism's Challenge in Race Relations. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1960.
- Woofter, Thomas J. and Associates. Negro Problems in Cities. New York: Harper & Bros., 1928.

Journals and Periodicals

- Allport, Gordon W. "Religion and Prejudice," The Crane Review, II, No. 1 (Fall, 1959), 1-10.
- _____, and Bernard M. Kramer. "Some Roots of Prejudice," Journal of Psychology, XXII (1946), 9-39.
- Bettelheim, B., and M. Janowitz. "Ethnic Tolerance: A Function of Social and Personal Control," American Journal of Sociology, LV (1949), 137-45.
- Friedrichs, Robert W. "Christians and Residential Exclusion," The Journal of Social Issues, XV, No. 4 (1959), 14-23.

Holtzman, Wayne H. "Attitudes of College Men toward Non-Segregation in Texas Schools," Public Opinion Quarterly, XX (1956), 559-69.

Journal of the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference, The Methodist Church, 1960 (Los Angeles: Methodist Publishing House, 1962), pp. 240-48.

Los Angeles Times. Aug. 21, 1962.

Tillman, James A., Jr. "Fair Housing: A Conceptual and Analytical Frame of Reference," The Journal of Intergroup Relations, I, No. 4 (1960), 1-19.

Winder, A. E. "White Attitudes toward Negro-White Interaction in an Area of Changing Racial Composition," American Psychologist, VII (1952), 330-31.

Other Sources

City of Chicago. Report of the Commission on Human Relations. (Dec. 10, 1949, mimeographed.)

Friedrichs, Robert W. Questionnaire enclosed in a letter from Professor Friedrichs, Sociology Dept., Drew University, Madison, New Jersey, Sept. 4, 1962.

Kramer, B. M. "Residential Contact as Determinant of Attitudes toward Negroes." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1951.

Los Angeles County, Commission on Human Relations. "A Statistical Analysis of Population by Race for Census County Divisions of Los Angeles County for 1960," taken from reports of the U. S. Census Bureau. (Mimeographed.)

New York University, Research Center for Human Relations. "How People Feel and Act about Interracial Housing." (1957, mimeographed.)

Rosenblum, Abraham L. "Social Class Membership and Ethnic Prejudice in Cedar City." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, University of Southern California, 1959.

Seifert, Harvey, and Frank E. Shuler. "The Church and Human Relations." From a report on the Methodist Conference on Human Relations, Aug. 31 to Sept. 4, 1959, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

U. S. President (Kennedy). Executive Order: Equal Opportunity in Housing, Washington, D. C., Nov. 20, 1962.

Williams, Dorothy Slade. "Ecology of Negro Communities in Los Angeles County: 1940-1959." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, University of Southern California, 1961.